

AR3732



Presented to
The Library
of the
University of Toronto
by
James Stewart, Esq.

CA1Z1


-55C21

Government
Publication

Case

Canada. Royal commission on broadcasting
Hearings. v. 5-8. 1956.

1957



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

5

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

OTTAWA, ONT.

MAY 4, 1956

v. 5

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Ottawa, Ontario,
May 4, 1956

--- Upon resuming at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT:

MR. ROBERT M. FOWLER	Chairman
MR. EDMOND TURCOTTE	Commissioner
MR. JAMES STEWART	Commissioner
- - - -	
Mr. JOHN M. COYNE)	Counsel
MR. A. J. de GRANDPRE)	
MISS J.E. LEITCH	Assistant Secretary

APPEARANCES:

Northwest Territories

Mr. R. G. Robertson	Deputy Minister, Northern Affairs and National Resources
Mr. F.J.G. Cunningham	Deputy Commissioner
Mr. R.A.J. Phillips	Executive Officer, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources

Yukon Territory

Mr. Aubrey Simmons, M.P.

- - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: This morning we have two briefs, one from the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories, Mr. R. Gordon Robertson, and one from the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, Mr. F. H. Collins, and I am not positive at the moment whether Mr. Collins is here or whether someone is appearing for him.

MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Aubrey Simmons, the Member of Parliament for the Yukon, is going to appear.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Simmons, we are very pleased to have you here. After that, we are not positive of the timing, because we have a brief from the Canadian Labour Congress which we are expecting after that, but whether it will be later this morning or starting at two-thirty, I am still awaiting word for that. We may have a shorter morning, depending on how long these first two briefs require, and adjourn until two-thirty, or we may start the Labour Congress brief after if they are ready to go on.

- - - -

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Robertson, we are glad to have you here. Will you file your brief, first of all, which will be filed with the Secretary as Exhibit 31, and will you present it and outline it, or do whatever you wish about it.

MR. ROBERTSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

EXHIBIT NO. 31: Brief of the Northwest Territories.

MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do not propose to read the brief. If the members of the Commission should wish to direct my attention, or ask any questions about any particular part of the brief I shall be glad to try to answer it. I thought perhaps the best course may be if I could outline rather more briefly, and perhaps with a little more

highlighting, the situation in the Northwest Territories that moves us to make some representations to this Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: That, I think, would be excellent. I do suggest you outline it because it gets it into our minds and makes it public to some extent.

MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I think the presentation of the argument on behalf of the Northwest Territories may perhaps come as something of an anti-climax or the insertion of a little bucolic and rustic peace after the briefs you have heard in the last couple of days. We are not here to argue whether the private radio or public radio has all the virtues, and we are not here to suggest that two television stations should be made to grow where one grew yesterday. The area that I represent is unmarred by any of the clashes of private or public radio; it is unmarred by any problems about children's eyes in connection with television. It has neither service. In the Northwest Territories there is no radio service, Canadian radio service, there is no television whatever, and the purpose of my appearance here this morning on behalf of the Northwest Territories is to urge that this condition of rustic and bucolic peace should be brought to an end and that we should be permitted to have equal rights with the rest of Canada and have all these controversies and confusions brought to our presence.

The situation in the Northwest Territories that is basic in this is that distance is the most

profound and most pervading problem that has to be faced in the entire territory. On the economic front, in matters of economic development, it usually appears in the guise of transportation and costs of transportation. While many people have thought that the most important problem perhaps in the economic development of the North is climate, those of us who have studied it, and the citizens of the territory, are satisfied that is not the most important problem. The most important problem is the reduction of the cost of transportation, and when one moves over from the economic situation to the social, the human, the municipal problem, again it is distance that is the most important single problem, and in the human form this represents itself as isolation, isolation from the other members of the community in the Northwest Territories, isolation from the rest of Canada and isolation from the rest of the world. The population, as everyone knows, is quite sparse in the territories, and most of it is scattered at present in the Mackenzie Valley and the area of Great Slave Lake. There is only one settlement of a large size -- large in Northwest Territories' terms -- and that is Yellowknife. There are three settlements that number their population in hundreds: the settlement at Aklavik, Hay River and Fort Smith. The rest of the settlements number their population in tens or dozens and are scattered with usually 100 or 200 miles between these small settlements.

In the entire territory there is only one

weekly newspaper. There are no daily newspapers whatever. The outside papers can be received, but the only mail service that is regular is air mail, and receiving outside newspapers by air mail is extremely costly, and most people cannot do it. To receive newspapers by surface mail means that they arrive only sporadically and they are extremely out of date and useless for keeping in touch with events in the country or in the world.

There is no telephone service, apart from local service in Yellowknife and Fort Smith. There is no wire telegraph service. There is a wireless service, but this is of limited value.

The mail, other than I have mentioned, the only regular ones are air mail which limits the kind of mail that can be received because of cost. Surface mail is costly and very slow.

Radio is the obvious means of establishing communication between the settlements in the Northwest Territories and between the people in the Territories and the rest of Canada and the rest of the world. However, at the present time there is no radio service that is reliably and regularly received in the Northwest Territories. The radio service that is most constantly and most frequently received is Radio Moscow. The radio stations that are next most frequently received are certain United States radio stations. The station in Seattle is heard more than the station in Vancouver for reasons I do not know. Certain stations in Southern

California are received and certain Alaskan stations are received in the northwestern part of the territories. When the Government of Canada decided to move Aklavik two or three years ago, the citizens of Aklavik first learned of this from the Fairbanks radio station. They had no news of it from any Canadian source.

This, in general, is the situation in which the people in the Northwest Territories live, and the result is one of a feeling of complete isolation from the rest of the world and particularly isolation from their fellow citizens in the southern part of Canada, and while the long winters are a problem, and while the period of darkness is a problem in the most northern parts, and while the cold in certain portions is a problem, I think it would be fair to say that one of the most serious and constant problems, and one of the greatest inhibitions of settlements there is this isolation. It is a constant thing people have to overcome and it is a constant deterrent to settle. I think the people of Canada have been coming to a steadily increased realization that the northern part of this country is important.

The Northwest Territories represent about one-third of all the area of Canada and we are gradually getting over our misconceptions about the territory. They are not an area of perpetual ice and snow and they are not an area of no economic possibility. In fact, it is quite the reverse. Mackenzie Valley is an extension of the Great Plains.

There are very good indications that the oil and gas possibilities may be large. There is only one producing well at the moment at Norman Wells, but there is no reason to believe that there are not others of quite a substantial scale. The mineral possibilities around Great Slave Lake are very large, and the forest resources in the valley are quite considerable, and the areas of arable land are growing up. While the area is not large in proportion to the total Mackenzie Valley area, it is thought now to be two million acres, whereas a few years ago it was thought to be half a million acres. In the Mackenzie Valley where there is arable land limited agriculture is definitely a possibility. There has been an experimental farm at Fort Simpson for a number of years and it has operated successfully. There is no question there are possibilities of settlement and development in the Mackenzie Valley and the Great Slave Lake region. In the Cambrian Shield which occupies the larger part of the territory there are all the mineral possibilities that there are in Quebec and Ontario, but the prospects have only been scratched because the means of transport are so limited thus far, but the prices of base metals and other metals are steadily reaching the point where the exploitation of this is becoming economic. There is no question in the minds of those of us who have studied this matter that the economic possibilities of the Northwest Territories are very considerable indeed, and one of the important things in realizing these

economic possibilities is not simply to reduce the costs of economic exploitation, but it is to try and remove the difficulties in the way of settlement, to make it more attractive for people to go there to compensate for the difficulties that they feel at the present time, and, as I have mentioned, one of the most important of these is this sense of isolation and lack of communication.

We feel that the way in which the Northwest Territories should be looked at now is much the way in which we would look at the Prairie Provinces if we could carry ourselves ^{back} fifty years, but know what the possibilities of 1955 are. At the turn of the century they only had a few thousands of population, the settlements were scattered, the character of development was not known with any degree of certainty. Now we know what has happened. The development in Mackenzie Valley and the rest of the territories will not be the same in character or scale, but I would submit there is no question but that the development is going to be very large indeed.

In urging that the Government of Canada should do something to reduce the sense of isolation by establishing radio service, it seems to us that there are two main problems. One is to get Canadian programmes to the territories. This probably means beaming programmes up by means of a short-wave station established somewhere in the south. Winnipeg has been mentioned as one place that would be technically suitable for this. Then, in the Northwest

Territories what would appear to be desirable is the establishment of a few local stations, initially perhaps four stations -- Yellowknife, Hay River, Norman Wells and Aklavik. There is none of those settlements at the present time that could support a private radio station on a commercial basis. There simply is not the market or the potential revenue there for that. So that any local stations would initially have to be established with some form of assistance by the CBC or by the Government. We realize that this kind of radio service could not be provided on a basis that would finance itself out of any revenues that would be received in the Northwest Territories, and it may be that the CBC would feel that such a service could not fairly be financed simply as part of the ordinary CBC service. If that is the case, it is our view in the Northwest Territories that the Government should consider the establishment of some kind of northern service that would perhaps be financed on a special basis as a matter of national policy.

THE CHAIRMAN: You sort of put it in the same category as the international service?

MR. ROBERTSON: Something of that nature, yes -- that is, if this is thought to be the desirable course. We are simply suggesting that if it cannot be financed or regarded properly as part of the ordinary service, then there should be a special arrangement to provide radio in this area where there is a very special need but where revenues cannot at this stage, at any rate, be found.

The radio service, if it could be established on some basis like this, would have values beyond the ordinary value of news and entertainment and communication. There are parts of the territory where it is extremely difficult to establish schools. Many of the people, particularly native people or people of mixed blood living there live a semi-Nomadic type of life and they live in such small and scattered groups that it is not possible to provide schools in the locality. The course being adopted is to establish hostels along with day schools and children will be brought to these hostels and educated in schools in certain centres.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean living in the hostels almost like a boarding school?

MR. ROBERTSON: That is right, it is like a boarding school except the school in the locality will be a school for the community, say Fort Simpson, and also the children living in the hostel brought in from the surrounding areas. Even with this there will be a lot of children for whom it is going to be extremely difficult to provide education, and one way in which something could be done, if adequate radio service could be established at a later date, is perhaps some form of radio school which could be established. This is done now in the northern territory of Australia and is also being done in the more remote areas of New Zealand. We have studied their procedures to some extent and we think it would have definite application in certain parts

of the Northwest Territories.

There is one further service radio could provide and that is simply in giving certain of the adult people a chance to acquire some knowledge and familiarity with the English language. One of the most important difficulties a lot of them have in securing employment is that they do not speak English, or speak it so little that for employers it is too great a hazard to take them on. This applies to Eskimos and Indians, and if there was some means by which they could be given certain courses in English and then could hear English over the radio service there would be a much better chance of their developing in the economic field.

I think, generally, that covers the submission I would like to make to this Commission. If there are any questions I will be very glad to try to answer them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Robertson, I think we all agree this has been a very interesting presentation and an important one. As you started by saying, this is a much calmer atmosphere than we have had for the last three or four days, and therefore the extent and nature of the questions will not be as great as for the other briefs, but I do believe Mr. de Grandpre may have a few questions. I have a few noted down to ask you. Mr. de Grandpre, will you start, please?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. What would be the total budget of the Northwest Territories per annum?

MR. ROBERTSON: About \$1,800,000 per annum.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And did your department ever make surveys as to the proper locations of transmitters, either short-wave or long-wave, if you have made any surveys or if you have had any surveys made by other people?

MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, this is a technical matter which neither the Administration of the Northwest Territories nor the Department of Northern Affairs felt that it could usefully do anything about, but a year ago we did get in touch with the CBC to ask them if they would examine the situation, and they sent two members of their staff to the Northwest Territories to see about the local conditions there and to make certain investigations as to what could be done to provide radio service, but we didn't feel that we could do anything like that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And it is as a result of this survey which was made by the CBC that you have indicated that Winnipeg would probably be the suitable location for a transmitter?

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, I wouldn't know that. Winnipeg was mentioned as a suitable location.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, Mr. de Grandpre, the results of the studies by the CBC are what we received in Exhibit 15, one of the briefs filed by the CBC -- that is my guess.

MR. de GRANDPRE: A perusal of your brief and a perusal of the brief of the Yukon Territory has given me the impression that your problems are very similar, if not practically identical, as far

as radio coverage is concerned. Am I right in this assumption?

MR. ROBERTSON: In general, that is true. The Northwest Territories' problem is perhaps complicated a bit to the extent that the population is even less centralized, if you want to call it that, than the Yukon. In the Yukon you have, say, ten to fifteen thousand people now between whom there are distances of four or five hundred miles. In the Northwest Territories you have a population of sixteen to twenty thousand between whom there are distances in some cases of two thousand miles; but, basically, the problem is the same.

MR. de GRANDPRE: So that the Commission could, for practical purposes, tackle the two problems in the same light, in general terms?

MR. ROBERTSON: I think so.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Could you tell me what would be the approximate annual income of the Indian and Eskimo population of the Territories? The reason I am asking this question is that if there is any question of a licence fee I would like to see what is the capacity to pay and whether it would create a heavier burden on the population of the Northwest Territories than it would create on the population of the rest of Canada.

MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, to reduce this to averages would not indicate the true situation, so perhaps I could make a few remarks on this. The largest part of the Indian population -- the

Indian population is all within the tree line and most of it in the Mackenzie Valley -- the largest part of it gets its living from trapping and hunting. The living by hunting -- meat and that sort of thing -- is, of course, an income in kind for which we have no figures of any relevance. The income from trapping, which is the major source of cash income, has fallen on very evil days. The fur trade is perhaps the most depressed industry in Canada. The prices of fur are fixed internationally, and because of developments in modern life, such as heated automobiles, and so forth, synthetic materials and things of that kind, the price of fur is generally lower today than it was in the most depressed period of the thirties. This may not reflect itself, Mr. Chairman, in the price of a fur coat, but that is the situation with regard to raw furs. The result is that the Indian population has to try to live on a sub-1933 income paying 1955 prices plus the freight rates that go into things in the territory. The Indians, when they can, eke out this revenue with employment in the summer to the extent that employment is available, but I would think that the average cash income of an Indian in the Mackenzie Valley may be in the vicinity of . . . Mr. Cunningham, the Deputy Commissioner, suggests \$800 to \$1,000. I would say it was lower, but this is certainly the outside figure for Indians in the area on the average. The people of mixed blood would be in a somewhat better economic position. The white people are for the most part either employees of mines

or government, and their incomes are the ordinary incomes for the kind of employment plus certain northern allowances. I think that is the situation.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Everything is relative: for a man living in the south \$800 or \$1000 a year may be very little, but is it also very little for people living in the Northwest Territories, or is it cheaper to live there than it is to live down here?

MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, I think that as far as the local resident population in the Mackenzie Valley is concerned, it would shock most of the people in Canada to see the conditions under which they live and the standards at which they do live. They are extremely low and depressing.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is all, Mr Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I have one or two questions. This last question of income raises another point and, I suppose, underlines your statement that any radio operations in that area could not get much in the way, if any, of commercial revenue, but the other side of the cost factor would be the question of receiving sets: can they afford them or does the problem of getting radio communication into that area also involve some form of public supply of radio receiving sets?

MR. ROBERTSON: We hadn't thought of that, Mr. Chairman. As far as reducing isolation and providing news is concerned, a lot of these who feel this the most acutely are the people who come there from the southern part of Canada, and they

are not the categories I have been talking about. They are the employees of private enterprise and government and that sort of thing, who could provide their own receiving sets, but their numbers up there are very small. As for the others, the priorities that Indians and Eskimos place sometimes surprise some of us down here, and the chance is that they would have a receiving set quite early even if the children didn't have a new piece of clothing and even if they didn't have quite the food they wanted at certain times. The Deputy Commissioner suggests there would certainly be one for each group that live together, and I think that is true.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose on your schooling suggestion, that might involve some expense indirectly to the public in so far as they are providing the school facilities?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, the schools up there are provided on a joint basis by the Federal and Territorial Governments. The Federal Government pays the proportion of school costs that relates to the number of children attending a school that are Eskimo or Indian. The Territorial Government pays the cost in proportion to the number of white children.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose as a practical matter we are talking entirely of radio, and that is, at least, as far ahead as we can go?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be in the brief -- I

have forgotten -- but what is the present population?

MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, we don't know for sure. The last census was 1951 and at that time the total population was just over 16,000, broken down roughly, 4,000 Indian population, 7,500 Eskimo population, and the remainder white. There is going to be a new census this year and we think the population is up a bit; I would think around 18,000 or 19,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, this may be a very difficult question to answer, but have you worked out any sort of forecasts of population? I admit, in part, it is the root of the problem you are raising -- isolation -- and obviously if you didn't have that you may have more people, but has any trend of population been thought of?

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, as you suggest, it largely depends on economic development. As far as the Indians and Eskimos are concerned, the population in each case is increasing by natural increase quite rapidly, more rapidly than the natural increase for the rest of the inhabitants of this country. Projections can be made of those populations, but the question of economic development comes in there because there may or may not be the means of employment to sustain the population that will grow. As for the white population, there is no basis we can find for any projections. It depends entirely on how economic development goes. If economic development takes a surge ahead, population will come in from the south quite rapidly, so I am afraid we

haven't got anything we could regard as reliable.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wondered if there had been any projections made.

MR. ROBERTSON: We have tried them but they don't mean much.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You say there is not a single radio station in the entire territory: at the end of your brief there is a map with two circles, one near Aklavik and one near Yellowknife saying "Present local coverage"; what does that mean?

MR. ROBERTSON: What I intended to say was that there was not a single radio station of CBC or private. There are two local stations now, and there used to be three until a few months ago; one at Aklavik, one at Yellowknife and one at Hay River, and these have been operated by the Canadian Corps of Signals just as a goodwill gesture to the community. They play whatever discs or tapes they can get in from time to time, which are very scattered and few and far between -- in the case of Aklavik particularly. They are operated just by any local citizens who feel they have a little time and they can go to it. They go down and put records on and play them and that sort of thing.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: There is no definite time schedule? It is as it fits their mood?

MR. ROBERTSON: They try to maintain schedules, and if they can get the local committees adequately moved, they can do that. The station at Hay River was recently closed up. The Corps of Signals found the equipment they had had to be replaced

or was no longer useful, and they felt it was not their function to provide radio service and they decided they were not going to replace it, so that station has disappeared. There are now the two left, at Yellowknife and Aklavik. Those may also disappear when their equipment runs out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any additional problem, Mr. Robertson -- and I am not asking for anything that is secret -- but arising from the northern defence lines and the population there, or are they getting radio service of their own?

MR. ROBERTSON: They are not getting radio service of an entertainment kind. They have essential communications for operation of aircraft and that sort of thing. One of the questions I assume may arise at some point in connection with the morale of the men who have to operate these stations is that of providing some sort of radio service for them, but at the present time there is no means.

THE CHAIRMAN: My question is really as to whether or not, if we are thinking in terms of cost, I suppose it all comes out of the same public purse, but is this in part something that might be carried within our defence appropriations -- is this a legitimate expense of the Defence Department?

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, the Distant Early Warning Line, of course, has been financed in its construction and at least for the initial three years is going to be maintained and operated by the United States. Whether they would try to provide

anything there, I am sure I don't know. I haven't heard anything to suggest it, but while I don't know, I would think it is probably unlikely that the Canadian Department of National Defence would feel it should do it when the United States is maintaining the line.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I wondered what the various elements were there, and all the various factors were which would lead to a sort of responsibility in the establishment of this service.

MR. ROBERTSON: One thing the line will do, Mr. Chairman, and that is tend to polarize the population in that area -- I don't mean in the geographical sense -- but the settlements will develop to a greater extent in that area simply to serve, staff and maintain some of these stations.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You have two maps attached to your brief, the second of which shows the Northwest Territories in its entirety, and it covers a tremendous area, but I take it most of your remarks this morning have been focused more on the district of Mackenzie rather than the overall territory; is that correct?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, sir, and not even entirely on the whole district of Mackenzie. The District of Mackenzie runs over more or less to a vertical line you will see on the map at about 108 degrees west.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The Northwest Territories covers such a tremendous area north and south

and east and west, and you mentioned the possibility of a station in Winnipeg, and I was wondering whether one station in one locality could cover that whole district?

MR. ROBERTSON: I must say, Mr. Commissioner, we had been thinking at this stage primarily of the Mackenzie Valley because that is the area where there is most need because there are most people, and we did feel it was perhaps a bit early to hope for any reliable coverage for the whole area.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You also mentioned the possibility of establishment of local stations at Yellowknife, Aklavik, Hay River and Norman Wells: if you had local stations where could you get the talent from to provide programmes, or would these programmes be by means of discs?

MR. ROBERTSON: Our understanding is that these would be mainly by rebroadcast programmes that would be picked up from the short-wave service. In other words, the general Canadian programmes would be beamed to the north by a short-wave station, say, at Winnipeg, and picked up on short-wave receivers by these stations in the four localities and rebroadcast on the medium or long-wave band to the local area.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Oh, I see. You are thinking of them more as relay stations than as a means of individual broadcasting?

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, there would be certain amounts of local news that would be broadcast, local

activities, and they might in some places be able to get a local choral group or something like that that would perform from time to time, but I think for the staff of life they would have to depend on the re-broadcast.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I take it you are no more expert in this field technically than I am?

MR. ROBERTSON: That is right, sir.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: So, I think we will have to discuss the costs and technical operations of such stations -- in fact, this whole subject, the technical end of this whole subject -- I should think we would have to discuss it with the officials of the CBC.

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, I am sure we could not contribute very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we are most grateful, Mr. Robertson, to you and your associates. Thank you very much.

YUKON TERRITORY

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Simmons, we are very glad to have you here to present the brief for the Yukon Territory.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, before you start, we should file your brief, and that will be Exhibit 32.

MR. SIMMONS: I file this brief on behalf of the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory.

EXHIBIT NO. 32: Brief of the Yukon Territory.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I was very interested in the remarks in the submission made by Mr. Robertson on behalf of the Northwest Territories. The same conditions, I might say, apply equally as well to the Yukon Territory in so far as radio service is concerned. I believe Mr. Robertson has given a very full picture of the conditions as they apply, and I don't believe there is any need of my duplicating the remarks he has made.

-

-

-

-

However, in presenting this brief I would like to say that Canadians who tend to think of the north as a frontier newly rolling back must make some qualification in the case of the Yukon. It made its economic mark more than half a century ago. In 1900 its capital, Dawson, was three and a half times the size of Edmonton. The Yukon is served by a railway to the sea, by road to north and south, and to developed mining areas within the Territory. The economic foundation of the Yukon, minerals, can be measured in terms not only of promise but of performance.

Whitehorse, the present capital, is a modern and expanding town. Its present prosperity and the solidity of its future hopes were recently symbolized in the opening of a bridge across the Yukon River to relieve the land hunger of a booming community and permit the orderly development of the capital of a territory making a considerable contribution to national wealth. The Alaska Highway, the railway to Skagway and a regular air service with Edmonton have consolidated the physical links with the world outside.

Even within the field of transportation there is no room for complacency, and much remains to be done to improve facilities within the Yukon. There is, however one aspect of communications which has lagged seriously and even startlingly behind -- radio. The lack of any adequate radio links with the remainder of Canada has not only heightened the sense of isolation among the Yukoners, but it has also contributed to a psychological separateness which is as much a loss to the rest of

Canada as it is to the Yukon.

Residents of the Yukon are thoroughly alive to the benefits of radio and to the part which it can play in helping them to share the national life of Canada. Their frustration at being deprived of this link with the rest of the country is consequently the greater. There are many receiving sets within the Territory. There are transmitting stations at Whitehorse, at Dawson and at Watson Lake. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that these transmitting stations are very low power. The one at Whitehorse when the conditions are very favourable will reach out within a radius of fifty miles, but not usually more than twenty. And this one station in particular, at Whitehorse, is controlled by the Department of National Defence, but the operation is a joint venture of the personnel of the army and the town people of Whitehorse.

The stations themselves cannot realize anything like their potential, not just because of deficiencies in equipment or shortage in staff, but because these stations themselves share the isolation of all Yukoners. They cannot regularly receive the transmissions of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation or other Canadian radio stations to the south. They do not possess the material for any sort of regular service, and they will not do so until somewhere in southern Canada a powerful transmitter is built to provide the material.

Meanwhile the radio stations of the Yukon base their programs largely on tapes and discs. How-

ever, I will say that Mr. Dunton has done his level best to provide them with sufficient programs to keep them going.

Members of the Royal Commission who are aware of the strenuous efforts made by all radio stations in the southern parts of Canada to bring news and special events to their hearers with the utmost promptness can understand the frustration of Yukoners in hearing Christmas broadcasts in mid-January or in listening to summer programs when the snows have begun to fly. The answer of the radio listeners in the Yukon or anywhere else is natural and understandable -- to switch off or switch over.

Radio listeners in the Yukon can switch over. A glance at the map is a reminder that the Yukon is roughly a triangle surrounded on two sides -- from the point of view of radio -- by the United States, and bounded on the third by a radio vacuum. Broadcasts from California and the northwestern United States reach the Yukon with reasonable reception especially in winter, even though stations in British Columbia do not.

Now, I know from experience that we can very seldom pick up a CBC station in the Yukon; it seems a shame. That is why we Yukoners feel neglected. We are an integral part of Canada and should live a Canadian life. And this is one way to provide us with the entertainment so badly needed.

Alaska lies to the north and to the west, and its stations in Juneau, Anchorage and Fairbanks give the Yukon a radio coverage which, if it were only

Canadian, residents of some southern communities might envy.

While the Yukon has been neglected by Canadian radio, it is not only the United States which has, unconsciously, stepped into the breach. The regular broadcasts of the Soviet North American service are widely heard if not appreciated. One need cast no reflection on the residents of the Yukon to note how interesting a target the Yukon can be for Radio Moscow. Here is an area of 200,000 square miles with only one weekly newspaper, no adequate Canadian radio, a sense of isolation and a hunger for news and entertainment. The operators of the Soviet service may well consider that residents of such an area are likely to tune in on Soviet programs of music, forgetting to switch off the set when less rewarding fare follows. They may also look upon the Yukon as an interesting battleground of Soviet and American ideologies through the medium of radio, while Canadian viewpoints are totally absent. It is a situation in which no Canadian from Dawson to Halifax can take pride.

Clearly the Yukoners do not look upon Soviet and U.S. broadcasts in the same way. In the absence of Canadian transmissions, the U.S. stations have filled some gaps and they have been appreciated. But radio from the United States or from any other place outside Canada is not adequate to Canadian needs. The need for Canadian news is urgent and clear. It is somewhat galling for Canadian citizens to have to depend upon a foreign station so regularly for news of national or local importance.

They cannot expect the foreign station -- to which Canada is only a peripheral audience -- to satisfy the requirements and tastes of Canadians. The result must therefore be that Canadians, perhaps unconsciously, gear their requirements and tastes to the American stations.

Listening to a foreign station for news is loss enough, but radio is important for far more than news. The remoteness of the Yukon from the Canadian scene -- political, economic and social -- cannot but be heightened when it is impossible to receive information promptly and to hear talks and discussion regularly. In a part of Canada where the professional Canadian performance of music and drama presents such obvious, and usually insuperable, difficulties, the radio could do much to fill the gap. But it does not.

Commercial radio is not at present feasible anywhere in the Yukon. Even, however, if a private radio station did become a financial possibility in Whitehorse the Yukon's radio problem would be far from solved. Somehow -- and it is obvious that the answer must be public funds -- the means must be found to feed the local stations with programs of Canadian origin on a regular basis. Simultaneously the local stations must be strengthened by the provision of new equipment and more adequate staff.

Now, that, Mr. Chairman, seems to be the concensus of opinion throughout the north, with our stations of low power, there should be new equipment provided and more help employed on a different basis than it is now.

While we do not have within the Territory the highly technical advice with which to judge the best means of achieving our objectives, it would seem that the answer to the problem lies in the establishment of a powerful transmitter somewhere in southwestern British Columbia

The main purpose of such a transmitter would be to ensure that a wide variety of current radio broadcasts reached the Yukon regularly. There they would be picked up for rebroadcast by local medium or long wave stations. My understanding is, that sort wave is beamed to the Yukon and that it can be rebroadcast on long wave -- I hope I am right in assuming that -- as everyone up there has long wave receivers.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that has been indicated in evidence we have had, that this is technically feasible.

MR. SIMMON: The second requirement would therefore be come re-equipment and possibly re-organization in the existing stations in the Yukon. With this sort of arrangement, most residents of the Territory would then have a radio service comparable to that available to the majority of Canadians. For residents of the Territory unable to receive the local Yukon stations, there would still be hope of using short wave receivers to pick up broadcasts directly from the transmitter in the south.

The objective of the people of the Yukon is to be able to share in Canadian life. In the circumstances of the Territory there is no more hopeful -- or neglected -- means than radio. They ask that as far

as technical considerations permit they be allowed to hear the same programs as other Canadians whether they be news, fine music, sports broadcasts, drama, children's programs. The people of the Yukon recognize that they are but a small proportion of the population of Canada and that the cost of radio service per capita will be high. They are however doing the kind of development job for their Territory and the rest of Canada which denies them many of the material benefits taken for granted by most Canadians. They regard radio not merely as a form of entertainment in substitution for other outlets of recreation -- though this it will incidentally be -- but as a means of bringing Canada to the Yukon and the Yukon to the rest of Canada.

It is striking that nowhere has radio a greater role to play than in the north. And nowhere has less effort been expended by radio and associated services .

Page 781 follows.

Attached to this brief is a map of the Yukon Territory showing the relative reception of Canadian, American and Soviet programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: There seems to be no sign for Canada at all, so you do not receive Canadian programmes?

MR. SIMMONS: No, but we have had very good success in the reception we receive as far south as California. I remember the time when the Californian stations were our best programmes but I am sure that by establishing powerful radio stations somewhere in British Columbia it will solve the problem for the Yukoners who feel that they have been sadly neglected in the past. People in the north are completely dependent on their own devices and initiative to provide their own entertainment and have been for many years and I do not think Canadians would begrudge a single penny that would go to these people for a tangible liaison with the rest of Canada. I believe I have covered the points; there is no use duplicating what Mr. Robertson has said. If there are any questions I would be happy to answer them.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are very grateful to you, this has been a most interesting facet of our problem. As I said to Mr. Robertson, this is not a subject on which any extensive questioning is possible but perhaps Mr. de Grandpre has one or two factual questions.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I think we will cover the same type of question with Mr. Simmons that we

had with Mr. Robertson. What is the population of the Yukon territory?

MR. SIMMONS: Well, I think it would be in the neighbourhood of 12,000, and of that figure I believe the Indian population is 1700 and the rest are white Indians.

THE CHAIRMAN: As long as they are not wild Indians.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Mr. Robertson has made a distinction between the Indians and the Eskimos.

MR. SIMMONS: I do not believe we have more than eight or ten Eskimos in the Yukon Territory.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You will excuse my ignorance of the Territory. What would be the annual budget of the Yukon Territory?

MR. SIMMONS: About one and three-quarter million dollars.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And how does the annual income of the Yukon people compare with the annual income of the residents or inhabitants of the Northwest Territories, is it higher or at the same level?

MR. SIMMONS: Well, mining, of course, is the chief industry and transportation, and the pattern has fallen off considerably during the past few years. I would say it would be much higher because in the Northwest Territories they depend chiefly on traffic.

MR. de GRANDPRE: So you will not have the problem in the Yukon that they have in the

Northwest Territories to either buy a receiver or to contribute towards the cost of a licence fee, and things like that?

MR. SIMMONS: No, well I think we would be in a better position to do that in the Yukon than in the Northwest Territories, especially in the northern part.

THE CHAIRMAN: From what you said, Mr. Simmons, I take it there are quite a number of radio receiving sets in the Yukon getting these Russian and American programmes?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, I think on a per capita basis we have as many as anywhere in Canada in the populated areas.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, it has been suggested by Mr. Robertson that a service which he called the Northern Radio Broadcasting or Broadcasting Service could be established somewhat along the lines of the international service and managed by the CBC. Does the Yukon agree with this suggestion or would you prefer to have the exact CBC coverage through a short-wave transmitter located somewhere in British Columbia?

MR. SIMMONS: Well, naturally, we prefer Canadian programmes, we are Canadians.

MR. de GRANDPRE: No, but the northern broadcasting service would transmit Canadian programmes except that it would not be in a prolongation of the CBC network in toto.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, we do not care as long

as we get the service, that is the main thing. We have been neglected long enough so let us see what is going to happen.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Mr. Simmons, you say there are three stations in the territory, one at Whitehorse, one at Dawson and one at Dawson Lake; are those commercially operated, privately owned and commercially operated?

MR. SIMMONS: No, I believe the National Defence have stations down here and it is just a matter of convenience for the people in the immediate area, but it will not reach out at all, if they get ten or twenty miles they are doing very well.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: The coverage is very low?

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Because you say that the radio stations of the Yukon base their programmes largely on tapes and discs, do you know who supplies these tapes and discs?

MR. SIMMONS: The CBC.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: I think you said Mr. Dunton was very helpful and sent them out, but do they come mainly from the CBC?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. Prior to three years ago the Armed Services of the United States were supplying the discs and we had no difficulty in getting sufficient at that time, so we are penalized again for being Canadians which is not right.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: It occurred to

me, I happen to know the CBC's international service sends to foreign countries many recordings and transcribed records, music or drama, and that is a cheap way of covering the area, giving coverage, and perhaps something could be done in Canada by recording as many as possible the good Canadian programmes, live programmes, which you would get possibly two or three days later because of the plane service provided your sets are powerful enough to reach the audience?

MR. SIMMONS: We are not too fussy up there.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Transcribed programmes, unless you are aware of it, are as good as if they were live, and I am sure this could be done much more cheaply than by establishing stations with a powerful transmitter which would cost \$1 million or \$2 million, whereas transcribed recordings you could get very cheaply.

MR. SIMMONS: I think we are entitled to the same service as they have in the more populated areas in Canada.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: That may be a way of giving it to you cheaper.

MR. SIMMONS: I do not see why there is any distinction at all, that is my candid opinion, and I am speaking, I believe, for everyone in the Yukon Territory when I say that.

THE CHAIRMAN: One question I have, Mr. Simmons. About the last page of your brief you say:

"They regard radio not merely as a

form of entertainment in substitution for other outlets of recreation -- though this it will incidentally be -- but as a means of bringing Canada to the Yukon and the Yukon to the rest of Canada."

Now, I can understand Canada coming to the Yukon but I wondered how you were going to bring the Yukon to the rest of Canada.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, if we do not know what is going on in Canada how are we going to do anything?

THE CHAIRMAN: I was on rather a semi-technical point, the possibility of originating programmes in the Yukon to the rest of Canada is not very practical.

MR. SIMMONS: No, this is a plea of the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, I do not know what his views are.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can understand certain news broadcast of certain other things could happen. Well, Mr. Simmons, we are appreciative of your coming and presenting your remarks to us. This is an informal hearing and I see Mr. Dunton is here, and I would ask him if he has any comment he would care to make at this stage on these two briefs. I have given him no warning and he will have nothing prepared. Mr. Dunton, if you want to leave it, it is perfectly all right, but if you have any comments we will be glad to hear them.

MR. DUNTON: We have been very interested in broadcasting to the North for some time, and,

actually, more is being done now than is realized. A service of about forty to fifty hours a week is going out to some stations by tape and some by disc. Now, a rough guess, I am going by memory, of \$70,000 a year for service to the stations of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories naturally is not completely satisfactory, by any means, because people up there want a great many things live. In our submission to the Commission we outlined a possible plan which appears to our people as a most economical way of getting reasonable service, re-equipping all the small stations there. The small stations are run on a community basis and this would provide a live service to short-wave stations and in the interval the improvement of the disc and tape services. I would emphasize that, as we have been explaining to the Commission, as sound broadcasting grows this may still not give complete service to the Yukon and Northwest Territories; it will simply mean the small stations will operate more efficiently, they will carry good live service, a daily trans-Canada service all across Canada, and all the people who can be served by that, people outside these centres, will be able to get pretty good short wave, a Canadian short wave service directed at them. Our technical men think Vancouver would be the best place to put the station, it would be with two transmitters, the likelihood being there would have to be two stations and technical studies will show whether it should be possibly Winnipeg or Montreal.

This area is an auroral zone, which I do not understand but it is one of the areas that is known as the worst place in the world to get short wave propagation through, but I think from Vancouver quite a good job could be done.

MR. SIMMONS: May I ask Mr. Dunton a question. In piping programmes over land wire I would like to know whether you could pipe music over?

MR. DUNTON: Yes, I forgot to add, in addition we are sending national news and some other important items by land line to the Whitehorse station at a certain cost. Now, that line is extended only for voice quality. As is usual, if we paid more the communication people could bring it up to music quality and we could have service there, but carrying a full daily service over such a line would be expensive, from Edmonton to Whitehorse.

MR. SIMMONS: I would say that we are very appreciative of what you are doing in trying to help us out in that area, especially the news coverage.

THE CHAIRMAN: Am I right in thinking that in addition to the improvement of the local stations would you also add these two powerful transmitters?

MR. DUNTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the cost of establishing short-wave transmitters?

MR. DUNTON: About \$2½ million for the two stations. Our suggestion would be to

establish one at about \$1 $\frac{1}{4}$ million and then see if the second set of transmitters turn out to be necessary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you given any consideration to the suggestion of Mr. Robertson that this ought to be a kind of segregated budget for this purpose?

MR. DUNTON: I think it is very simple, if we have the money we can do the job, I do not think there are any really great complications about a separate service, but certainly in one form or another you would have to have the money to do it.

MR. de GRANDPRE: May I ask a question which may prove my ignorance on the technical aspect of the question. Mr. Dunton, could you tell me why the suggestion is made in the brief of Broadcasting Service in Northern Canada that these stations should be in the southwestern part of British Columbia? I would think that the higher you put them up the farther it would be possible to send.

MR. DUNTON: It is an extremely complicated problem, but I can explain it this way: short-wave high frequency waves go very high through the various layers before they bounce down again, therefore, in short-wave transmission you get better reception at a great distance and with the engineering studies our people have made so far they think they could get about the best bounce and the best spray over that area. There is a curious band of auroral disturbance that runs :

the St. Lawrence up to the Laurentian Shield. We get very poor reception by transmitters at Sackville because it goes right through this auroral zone.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We will adjourn now until two-thirty at which time the Canadian Labour Congress will present their brief.

---At 11.20 a.m. the Commission adjourned.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Ottawa, Ontario,
May 4, 1956.

---Upon resuming at 2:30 P.M.

<u>PRESENT:</u>	MR. ROBERT M. FOWLER	Chairman
	MR. EDMOND TURCOTTE	Commissioner
	MR. JAMES STEWART	Commissioner

- - - - -

MR. JOHN M. COYNE	Counsel
MR. A.J. deGRANDPRE	

MISS J.E. LEITCH	Assistant Secretary
------------------	------------------------

- - - - -

APPEARANCES:

Canadian Congress of Labour

Mr. Claude Jodoin	President,
Mr. Gordon G. Cushing	Executive Vice- President,
Mr. Donald McDonald	Secretary-Treasurer,
MR. Leslie E. Wismer	Director.

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: We will come to order now.

The brief we have to receive this afternoon is from the Canadian Congress of Labour. I may say to you, Mr. Jodoin, and to your associates, that the Commission is honoured in the fact that this, I understand, is the first official presentation that has been made by the Canadian Congress of Labour since it was formed.

We are very glad and looking forward to hearing this. You are, I think, accompanied by

Mr. Cushing and Mr. McDonald and Mr. Wismer. I take it you have planned to have Mr. Wismer present it, but our practice here, Mr. Jodoin, is that you don't need to stand unless you wish to. You may read what you wish of the brief, or summarize it. Certainly I hope you will be able to summarize at least the main points. After that we have some questioning, and as I have explained many times before the questions do not represent any opinions that have been formed. They are merely put to try and elicit a fuller explanation on whatever point it is directed to.

MR. JODOIN: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I am certain that you, sir, will not have any further misinterpretation in any statements because I notice that you refer to the Congress of Labour. It is the Canadian Labour Congress. I am positive that it will be the sole and only one because of the qualifications of yourself and the distinguished members of your Commission.

May I say this afternoon the Congress itself is represented by the Secretary-Treasurer, Donald McDonald, and Mr. Wismer will make the submission. You will also notice that we are accompanied by a representative, a very able one, and it is not necessary for me to name him at the moment. He is also very well known, and his qualifications are recognized, representing some of our affiliated organizations to the Canadian Labour Congress who are definitely concerned with the radio and television question as far as our great country

is concerned, so without any additional comment it will be my pleasure at this time to turn the procedure over to Mr. Wismer, our Director of Legislative Service for the Canadian Labour Congress.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. WISMER: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I would like to file our submission with the secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That will be, I think, Exhibit No. 33.

---EXHIBIT 33: Brief of Canadian Labour Congress.

MR. WISMER: Summarizing the supplement which the Canadian Labour Congress wishes to present to you to-day, sir, at the end of our submission we tried to summarize all the points which we were trying to make, and I think perhaps if you would turn to page 25 where we say "Summary and Conclusion" I might avoid adding anything to the brief in this summary, and I might avoid leaving anything out. The points which we have attempted to make throughout the brief is that the Canadian Labour Congress wishes no change in the fundamental principles of Canadian Broadcasting policy which have developed over the last twenty-five years, and in that we wish the C.B.C. to be maintained in the dominant and controlling position in both radio and television broadcasting. We wish the private stations to be maintained to private local service, and to be ancillary to the National system. We want no private networks either to be authorized or allowed. We are very concerned about the development

of monopoly within private radio broadcasting. We would like to see monopolies not allowed to develop in this field, and if they have developed that they be broken up. The same is true of the ownership of what we may call chains of radio or television stations.

Now, we might, later in the questioning, be a little more clear, but two factors in this respect, Mr. Chairman, are of great importance to us. We are aware of situations in Canada where you have a newspaper, a radio station, and a television station, all owned by the same interests, and therefore control all the news facilities in that community. We do not believe that that is a good thing for Canada. We believe that it is perhaps practical to leave a radio and television station under the same ownership and operation but it should be divorced from the newspaper, and in regard to the chains, that the ownership of a radio and a television station in a community, okay, but not more than that. If either of this type of monopoly or chain exists we ask you to recommend that these be broken up within a period of three years to give the interests in them time enough to sell or transfer their assets.

Another important subject: We would like to have it made completely clear that the C.B.C. Board of Governors is the regulating body for both radio and television with responsibility for the control of the operations of both the C.B.C. and the private stations. We believe that the C.B.C. Board of Governors could do a better job of enforcing the regulations. Our

understanding is that the enforcement of the regulations takes place down from the Board of Governors and through the management of the C.B.C. We think this is unsound. We think a better job could be done if the Board of Governors were to create a regulations enforcement branch directly under the board, reporting directly to the board. We would like to see the greatest possible use made of both radio and television facilities for programs, Canadian programs, and in that we would like to bring to your attention the important thing, that the C.B.C. provides the only National news outlet. Nothing else in this country is capable of covering the whole country with National news. For that reason we would like to see that extended. We would like to suggest that the C.B.C. might be encouraged to develop its own news gathering agencies, especially abroad, since we have no other Canadian news gathering facilities abroad. We believe also that the C.B.C. Board of Governors should go a little further under Section 22 and 23 of the Act in their reporting of their operations to Parliament, and that they should do a better job of reporting the operations of the private stations to Parliament, and in doing so we believe that they should make quite clear to Parliament the extent of the assistance and subsidies which they make to the private stations.

Quite naturally, sir, we believe that radio and television should give more employment to Canadian talent; that we should originate more programming in Canada, and in that employ our artists and develop our artists and other necessary employees of both the C.B.C.

and the private stations, and that to assist this, and perhaps to some extent assist in financing radio and television, for what they call the preserved program, the recorded program, that a substantial tariff should be placed on imported preserved programs. Perhaps I could make it clear what we have in mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we will want to ask you some questions about that. It is a new point to us.

MR. WISMER: More specifically on the financing of the C.B.C. itself, both radio and television, it is our recommendation that the C.B.C.'s revenues be provided by statutory grant from Parliament, that a small percentage of the C.B.C.'s revenues could reasonably come from commercial sources, but that the C.B.C. should not have to rely on revenue from commercial sources, and also that the C.B.C.'s capital requirements should be provided by Parliament.

We have in the brief made certain specific suggestions as to how the formulas are to be used for that. Perhaps that might come out in the questioning, but I think it is important to point out here that we have made these suggestions on the basis that the next four or five years may be a more rapid expansion period of television, and therefore we are not now suggesting that you sit again on another Royal Commission in four or five years from now...

THE CHAIRMAN: It is unlikely that we would be, either.

MR. WISMER: ...but that Parliament review the financial position coming to the end of this rapid

expansion period. Also we recommend that the C.B.C. be encouraged to market its programs abroad. That will indicate to you that at least we think some of the C.B.C. programs are excellent. Our other and final point is that in the development of television broadcasting, knowing what tremendous financial commitments that involves, we are still anxious, as the Canadian Labour Congress and its affiliated membership, that radio not be sacrificed, and that the two National networks, at least, discounting the French network for the moment, be maintained. Generally, sir, those are the main points in the brief.

Naturally the overall position we are taking is not necessarily that everything in the C.B.C. is perfect and that everything in the private stations is wrong, but we would like to see these principles maintained, and a long-range broadcasting policy maintained, in which the C.B.C. is the dominant factor.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have made a very clear statement of your main points. I hope that my suggestion of you giving a summary did not lead you to be more brief in this summarization than you had intended to be because we would welcome any amplification you would care to give on any of these points, or would you prefer to have it brought out by questioning?

MR. WISMER: Perhaps if we had questions, and if we felt we didn't get all our story over, we might elaborate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Don't hesitate to elaborate any point in the midst of the questioning. I think,

in the working as between counsel, Mr. Coyne, you were going to ask some questions on this brief, and on any related matters in which we might get some help from the people appearing before us now. So, will you start in, Mr. Coyne?

(Next page No. 801)

MR. COYNE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. What I was proposing to do, Mr. Wismer, was to go through your brief as a matter of order of procedure and question you on points which came to my mind in the course of going through the brief. Will you turn to page 3 where you are dealing with the scope of this present inquiry, and in that section you refer to the recitals or representations of the Order in Council, and particularly to one that the reconsideration of television broadcasting should be based upon the principles that a grant of the exclusive use of certain frequencies or channels for broadcasting shall continue to be under the control of the Parliament of Canada, and that the broadcasting and distribution of Canadian programmes by a public agency shall continue to be the central feature of Canadian broadcasting policy. Then you go on:

"In other words, your Commission has not been charged with finding any new overall broadcasting policy in other sound radio or television broadcasting. . . ."

I suppose you mean that it would not be proper for this Commission to recommend either that Parliament should discontinue its control over the licensing of channels?

MR. WISMER: Right.

MR. COYNE: Or that the broadcasting and distribution of programmes by the public agency should be discontinued?

MR. WISMER: That is right.

MR. COYNE: But I presume also that within those very broad limits you would agree that this Commission is entitled and indeed bound to examine into all the many different alternative methods that might be followed in the furtherance of those policies?

MR. WISMER: Well, as I read the Order in Council authorizing and setting up this Royal Commission on Broadcasting, and I think others of us who met together -- and we represent a large group of affiliated organizations directly interested in this matter -- I felt that the recital there indicated, as you have said, Mr. Coyne, that they did not set up this Commission to change the principles of broadcasting which Parliament establish and control to make sure all Canadians get television and radio programmes. At the same time, the recital of the various things you were to inquire into would indicate a pretty broad field.

MR. COYNE: If you turn on to page 5 at the very top, you say -- it actually starts at the bottom of the previous page --

"Some confusion, however, has arisen since the Board of Governors has not separated itself in the public mind from the Management of the CBC. This separation may need to be clarified in the Act, certainly it has not been adequately indicated to the public."

Would you be able to give us any suggestions or develop your ideas as to how this separation might

be accomplished?

THE CHAIRMAN: First of all, I would like to get in my mind, if I can, the kind of separation you have in mind. This, after all, is a corporate structure. The Board of Governors is the Board of Directors of the Corporation, and I would think that they were both in law and in fact in charge of the management of the CBC. Now, I am finding it hard, in that kind of corporate structure, to understand what you have in mind as to the Government separating itself in the public mind from the management of the CBC.

MR. WISMER: I shall try to explain what we had in mind. The Act seems to suggest to us the very simple thing that there shall be a Corporation and it shall have a Board of Governors -- I think it reads something in that nature -- and then goes on to create the necessary framework in which the Corporation shall be able to operate. What we are concerned about is this -- and perhaps this won't be useful to the Commission at all -- but in the public mind when the Chairman of the CBC speaks it is the CBC, and then they are confused by someone coming along and saying, "Well, really he is talking about regulating all radio broadcasting." Certainly, the general public has not read the Canadian Broadcasting Act and is not likely to read it. If some separation can be developed in which there could be a spokesman for the Board of Governors, the overall regulating controlling body of broadcasting

in Canada, and someone who speaks for the operational programme part of the Corporation to the public, some simple division like that might help to dispel this confusion in the public mind. I am not suggesting that the Chairman of the CBC is not competent to do that himself, but by one person speaking, on the one hand as the regulating body, controlling body, and the same person speaking for the operating body, that allows some other people to confuse the public about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, strictly speaking, it is only one Board as it is now set up. I am not questioning your point, but I am trying to examine it.

MR. WISMER: Oh, it is one Corporation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. WISMER: Section 6 of the Act says:

"There shall be a General Manager who shall be chief executive of the Corporation and shall be appointed by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Corporation."

In other words, he is a pretty senior person and directly responsible for the operations of the Corporation. Perhaps he could be built up in the public mind when he is talking about programme and the actual operations of the CBC, and leaving to the Board of Governors the overall job, because they have a big job trying to keep the private and public broadcasting system of this country only in the position which Parliament prefers.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are sort of drawing the distinction which in corporate practice may be sometimes drawn between the Chairman of the Board and the President?

MR. WISMER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Putting it the other way, one would be responsible for policy and the other one for actual management?

MR. WISMER: Yes, that is it -- probably the difference between President and General Manager in the ordinary corporation.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

MR. WISMER: We are not wanting to divorce the two. We don't want this thing to get into the shape where you have a separate regulating body. We don't want that at all. I think that would lead to worse things. It is to clarify in the public mind that there is a difference in the corporate structure in the overall broadcasting, both public and private, and keeping that meshed together with the actual operations of the publicly owned system.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is mainly directed, I take it, from the way you put it, to the way it is talked about?

MR. WISMER: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Rather than any actual question of fact. You wouldn't question that the Chairman of the Board of Governors would have to have general knowledge of operations?

MR. WISMER: Quite.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It is a public relations job you feel the Corporation should do as between the Governors and the Management Board?

MR. WISMER: That is correct. If it is necessary to amend the Act to do that, then we are suggesting it is done; but if it is not, then at least it has to be done publicly.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be convenient just at that point to pick one last statement that you made there. You said you were definitely opposed to the notion of a separate regulatory body?

MR. WISMER: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: You want the general legal and factual framework of the present situation. Would you care to expand on that as to reasons why you are opposed to the notion of a regulatory body?

MR. WISMER: Well, we have in the pages we are going through quoted the position of the former Labour Trades and Congress of Canada and the position taken by the former Canadian Congress of Labour before the Massey Commission, and pointed out the long interest we have had in it. We begin talking, according to the record, in favour of one public system and no private stations at all. Gradually this thinking changed, and while we were still for public control and ownership in the broadcasting field, these submissions suggest we were accepting the private station, accepting it as a local entity and as a part of the national public system. That is the policy, as I understand it, of the Canadian

Labour Congress and its affiliated bodies; that is the feeling. Within that position we cannot see how you can set up a separate regulating body and not create a condition, either then or shortly thereafter, in which the private stations begin to appear as something parallel with the national system. That we do not want to develop. We have seen and heard arguments that we have two railway systems in Canada, one publicly owned and one privately owned, and that we have a regulating body called the Board of Transport Commissioners. This has been argued as something that could be analogous to our broadcasting system, but it is not, because we have never over twenty-five years developed a separate private broadcasting system. We have maintained a position in which we have a public system and local private stations fitted into that public system. They are ancillary to that system. That is the policy we think is practical now and should be followed; it has merit, and if you are going to maintain that, you must maintain within the public system the regulating power as well as the operating power.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I see your point.

MR. COYNE: Since that question has come up, Mr. Chairman, I was thinking that I might ask Mr. Wismer this, and it is an expansion of his last answer. Could you tell us why you feel that an independent regulatory body would necessarily mean that the private broadcasters would grow and become parallel to or a rival of the national

system? The suggestion of an independent regulatory body has been put up to us on the basis, I think, that exactly the same regulatory powers that exist today would be exercised by this independent Board, and, of course, the independent Board would be appointed by the Government. I wonder could you indicate why you feel that this would necessarily result, as the Canadian Congress of Labour said before the Massey Commission, "The apparently harmless plea for an independent regulating body is, in fact, a demand that the CBC should be done to death"?

MR. WISMER: Well, that is pretty strong language, I admit, but suppose we assume -- and we are sitting in this very room -- that this was the Exchequer Court: wouldn't we all be in the position of coming as equals before the Court? If we start out in the same position to set up a separate regulatory body, then the CBC must come to it in the same way as the private stations come to it, and within even our traditional democratic thinking of this country they would have to come as equals which would begin to create a condition in which we might develop a private broadcasting system across Canada. This is what we want to avoid.

MR. COYNE: Turning now to page 7, Mr. Wismer, where you are quoting from the representations that the Trades and Labour Congress made to the Massey Commission, near the bottom of the page, you say:

"Perhaps the most compelling reason

for creating and maintaining a condition in national broadcasting in Canada in which no internal competition may occur at the system level was the existence of the incontrovertible fact that severe competition must be met by the existing national system at all times from external and, so far as this country is concerned, unregulated sources."

Are you speaking there of the fact that radio stations in the United States can be heard over large areas of Canada and there is nothing that can be done to keep them out?

MR. WISMER: Really, what I think is the thinking behind that language is this: at the time that was written we were pretty much concerned with radio and not television. The geographical location of Canada itself and of the main centres of population was such that almost all Canadians along the border can hear United States radio stations, so that that is a type of competition which is uncontrolled as far as we are concerned, and the national public system, to some extent, at least, if you like, sets up a screen and at the same time makes it possible to produce programmes in Canada so that Canadians can listen to the thinking and culture and various developments within Canada which in our opinion would not have taken place if you had simply left unrelated private stations to their own, or even if they could have created a private network; the

all-powerful CBS and NBC in the United States would have overshadowed them due to the long range in radio.

MR. COYNE: I was really leading up to this question, as to whether or not you would feel that this reason was as compelling in the case of television where the range of American stations is much less?

MR. WISMER: Well, there are certain parts of Canada, certainly in the Toronto and Southwestern Ontario area where this is as necessary as it is for radio. In Southern British Columbia and the Southern Prairies it is the same story. Perhaps it is not to the same extent in the province of Quebec, because of the language barrier. But, generally speaking, there is a large part of the population of Canada which, televisionwise are in the same position as they were radiowise.

MR. COYNE: I would take it from your answer that even in television there is a sufficiently large part of the population affected by this factor that you would say that in television this is also a compelling reason for creating and maintaining the condition spoken of?

MR. WISMER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the argument really based on the presence or absence of competition? I would take it that your theories were opposed to the idea of competition?

MR. WISMER: Oh, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Indeed, your argument at a later stage dealing with the dangers of

monopolies is -- after all, in one sense monopoly is the absence of competition, and therefore you cannot be opposed to competition per se. As phrased here, and I admit it is a quotation from a previous submission, you seem to be saying that we should not have any internal competition in Canada because we have got external competition. That is at the bottom of page 7. And that we cannot control the external competition, which sort of seems to suggest that if you could control it it may not be so bad. Isn't the real point the difference between Canadian programmes and American programmes?

MR. WISMER: I think that basically what we are trying to say -- and maybe the language is not too good there -- we were thinking that actually within Canada they are not basically competing between CBC stations and private stations. A great deal of the time they are meshed into a network.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course.

MR. WISMER: Basically we are not creating competition in Canada because we have got this kind of overall broadcasting system, but it was necessary to have that in order that we could have Canadian broadcasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that puts it more clearly than these words do.

MR. WISMER: Perhaps I should not say this in front of my officers, but you may have noticed in the last few days we have got tired of competing.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to raise that.

I don't think you were acting with great precision in your language when you said you were opposed to monopoly within private radio business.

MR. JODOIN: I don't know why Mr. Wismer hesitated to make that statement while officers were here. I think he is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us not regard all monopolies as bad.

MR. JODOIN: There are still some competitions.

MR. COYNE: Turning now, Mr. Wismer, to page 10, the bottom paragraph, you say:

"The way should never be opened for the creation of private networks."

Then again at the top of page 14 you are dealing more specifically with this subject and you say:

"It is extremely important that no private networks be allowed . . ."

Now, I wonder if you could expand a little on your reasons for this, but before doing so I might indicate the sort of thing I have in mind. We have heard from the CBC that the establishment of a second or alternate network by the public agency is largely a matter of funds and that on the \$15 scale which they have projected, and which is somewhat similar to your suggestions further on in your brief, that within that scale a second network simply could not be established for lack of funds, and my question would be this: If that were so what would be your objection to the private stations, if they could do so

financially at no cost to the public, forming some sort of regional or even national network amongst themselves and thereby provide an alternative television programme to the public which the public agency itself was not able to provide?

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you add to that, Mr. Coyne, subject to certain definite regulations, presumably as to content of programmes?

MR. WISMER: Well, the position as I take it is this; so long as either a private radio station or a private television station operates singly, it will be able to reach a certain area, a certain section of the population and be able to charge an advertising rate in relation to that area, and, as such, would not be a particular competitor, if you wish, with any of the public broadcasting. At the same time, we know that a television station operating like that can be operated very cheaply; it may cost a lot to install it but it can operate very cheaply, and if then you allow it to hook itself up with another television station, presumably up goes the rate for advertising and it begins to become a real competitor of the national system.

THE CHAIRMAN: Might it not provide more employment for artists and musicians, and so on?

MR. WISMER: Perhaps I will answer your question this way, sir; the experience is that it will not. We point out here, and I think it is fair to say, that while we may not be satisfied with everything within the CBC as to industrial

relations, rates of pay, conditions of work and all those things -- and we can talk about that later, if you wish -- certainly they are far superior to the great majority of private radio and television stations. Whereas the CBC employs artists to produce live programmes, whether in radio or in television, our information is that out of more than 150 private stations in this country fewer than 40 ever employ live talent. It may provide more employment for what we call the disc jockey, but it is not providing employment for the talent, the sort of thing that would develop the theatre and music and culture and art of Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should definitely repeat that we are only asking these questions; you can only examine one witness at a time and we are trying to bring out all the points. The private stations did say to us that the reason they have not developed more talent is because they thought they were unable to develop network arrangements and that the individual station cannot support the cost of a live talent programme of any magnitude, and if several stations banded together they could do so. We don't know whether this was right or not, but this was their argument.

MR. WISMER: There may be something in that, but on the other side I don't see how we can take the position that we wish both in radio and television broadcasting that there be a national public system with the CBC the dominant factor --

and there are reasons -- and then say that we will allow some development of private network. To say even some development of private network, surely that is a step in a direction which could expand across the country, and then if you get a private network across Canada which would be capable of doing what the private broadcasters told you, surely we are moving right away from the policy we have been trying to establish for twenty-five years, that you shall have a public agency as the main feature.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would such a system necessarily mean the finish of the CBC?

MR. WISMER: I don't say it would mean the finish of them, sir, but assuming there is so much money to be spent commercially and otherwise on broadcasting, surely you couldn't expect it not to reflect in the revenues of the CBC.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, later on in your brief you criticize certain -- not certain programmes, but you state that there could be improvements here and there on CBC programmes. Don't you think competition might elevate the programming of both systems if we had alternate channels to go into?

MR. WISMER: I am not sure that it would.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It is a matter of opinion, I admit.

MR. WISMER: I am not sure it would.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, to take it perhaps another way -- and I am only trying to state the case because I don't think you were here while these

other points were being made: we have at the moment in television, I think it is eight CBC stations and some twenty-five private stations which are today operating as a national system. It has been said, and I think it is almost implicit in your brief, if not specific, that it would be a good idea to be able to give people an option, a choice of programmes.

MR. WISMER: That is quite right.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, if we could afford it, and finances were not important in this matter, there would be something to be said for having this option so that everybody would not have to listen to the same thing at the same time. Well, we have got an existing system made up of eight public and twenty-five private stations, which is capable of operating a national system. Then, why in theory is it dangerous to that system if you have another system, let us say made up of one publicly owned and thirty-three privately owned stations providing a network type of arrangement but subject to the overriding control of the state? Is this not an alternate feasible method, perhaps, of achieving a choice of programme which we all think is probably desirable if we can afford it?

MR. WISMER: I think it would be fair to say that the sooner we can have a choice of Canadian television programme in all parts of the country the better. What I think we are essentially saying here is that we would not like to see the development of a private network which is a private network

and not have in it the keystone of the public agency.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, in other words, you would then perhaps contemplate -- and there are many problems of economics involved -- but you would contemplate the creation of a second television network which might be predominantly, as the present one is in numbers, privately owned stations but you would want it to be part of the overall national broadcasting system?

MR. WISMER: That is correct.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Wismer, we have been told, at least in radio, that there are some connections which in at least one sense could be called private networks, that is, a series of private radio stations in a region develop a programme of wider than purely local interest and in order to distribute it and thereby share the costs of producing the programme they make arrangements with the CBC, or through the CBC, for what the CBC calls a subsidiary hook-up, and that, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, is a hook-up of unaffiliated stations for the purpose of simultaneous distribution of a programme.

MR. WISMER: Well, within the regulations of the CBC it does say that a network shall not be established without the prior consent of the CBC.

MR. COYNE: That is correct.

MR. WISMER: So, the Board of Governors are in a position to say "In this case you are in a position to operate a network".

MR. COYNE: That is correct.

MR. WISMER: That is, I think, a little

different from allowing a sort of ro^oted condition to develop where unless you monitored the programme all the time you would not know what they were doing, and that position to us seems to lead, it can lead to the development of a privately owned network right across Canada which would become increasingly difficult to be within the control of the Board of Governors of the CBC.

MR. JODOIN: I may add, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, if I may, that you must also consider the geographical position of Canada from coast to coast as well as its population, and can it provide the necessary funds for the maintenance of two national networks across Canada at this stage -- I doubt it; I don't think so. I would go more for the question of co-operation in the way that was mentioned a little while ago.

May I at this time, Mr. Chairman, use the opportunity, with your permission, of reading a very well unionized paper in Ottawa, The Ottawa Journal, where some additional representations were made by the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. I have all the respect in the world for Associations in Canada, and certainly I am prejudiced, and I recognize that too, and if I recognize the right of these Associations to speak, I also think that I have the right to correct some statements that were made. For instance, it says here that the CBC assures itself of vocal support from its employees and from organized labour generally

by paying uneconomically high rates. Well, may I just say this; as far as this Congress is concerned, the question of public utilities and public services, this is a matter of principle and we believe that it should belong to the people of Canada. This also seems to be an admission that the conditions are lower as far as those under the control of that Association are concerned. As you know, we proceed in accordance with the laws of Canada, and go through negotiations, consultations, arbitration boards and sometimes even on the verge of strike, so it is not a question of being at the disposal of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, but of making representations on behalf of those we represent. Of course, there are exceptions amongst the membership of the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. I think there are some of them who are providing reasonable conditions -- when they are unionized, of course -- but they admit by this kind of statement that the averages are lower. The only wish I express, sir, is that one of these days they will also be fully organized and provide working conditions commensurate with the Canadian standard of living.

I thank you for the opportunity of saying this, because I believe such statements, in my estimation, are definitely untrue, and as far as this Congress is concerned it is definitely a matter of principle, and as you have noted in the brief itself, it is not always a matter of bouquets of flowers. There are some constructive criticisms, as far as

that is concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, as I have stated before, Mr. Jodoin, we are anxious to hear and air any difference of opinion, and I am very glad you raised a point on which you disagree with the representation that has been made. I am very glad to have that.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Chairman, just following on at the moment on the question of the networks, I take it from what you say that you don't object to private networks in the sense in which these subsidiary hook-ups are now utilized, subject to the control of the CBC?

MR. WISMER: No, that is quite all right.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Limited networks, you mean?

MR. COYNE: Limited networks, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In a commodity as expensive as this, this may be a very desirable thing to have happen occasionally?

MR. WISMER: Quite. I think we ought to make one other point; that is the money which may be available in Canada to provide a separate television network, and it seems to us there isn't money in Canada to do that. It would have to come from abroad, and it is that sort of thing which, if it got out of control, we feel we just should not allow to happen. We happen to be geographically located next to the most powerful economic nation in the world capable of doing these things if you allow them. We are not objecting to them, or to their

culture or ideals, we are not objecting to their methods. What we want to preserve is our own.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are touching on one of the most fascinating aspects of this whole inquiry and a very essential one.

(Page 827 follows)

MR. COYNE: Mr. Wismer, turning the page to page 11 where you are referring to sections 22 and 23 of the Canadian Broadcasting Act you indicate that you feel the C.B.C. Board of Governors has failed to carry out its responsibilities under sections 22 and 23, and I was wondering what you had in mind, or whether you had specific examples of what you regard as failure to carry out responsibilities.

MR. WISMER: Let me put it this way, I realize that section 22 in some respects seems to be a bit permissive, but I think it is fair to say that the C.B.C. reports quite substantially, and elaborately, to Parliament on its own operations, financial position, what it is attempting to do to carry out its responsibilities during the year. But it has also responsibility for maintaining broadcasting which includes private stations, and from the language of section 22 and 23 it would appear that the Legislature had in mind that they would hear from the C.B.C. as to what was going on in the private stations, and what their relations were. We think it would have been better if the Board of Governors had let Parliament know what they knew about the private stations and what their relationships had been, and how far the private stations were carrying out the regulations, maintaining themselves in their operations as they promised to do when they obtained the license.

THE CHAIRMAN: The words are pretty specific in sub-section 2 of section 22. It says the corporation shall each year report the activities of

all private stations, and make a report, I take it that what you are suggesting is an annual report under sub-Section 2 of section 22.

MR. WISMER: Yes.

MR. COYNE: I think speaking legalistically sections 22 and 23 do not require the corporation, in their present form, to make the sort of report that Mr. Wismer appears to suggest.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right, the suggestion is that it should be amended to make it necessary.

MR. COYNE: That was the point of my question as to whether you recommend that the statute be amended if necessary to require this report.

MR. JODOIN: The answer is yes.

MR. WISMER: I might say I do not happen to be a lawyer so I cannot always be sure of what this language means.

THE CHAIRMAN: Even if you were you would not know.

MR. WISMER: One of the things in this respect we are really concerned about is that there is a thought every now and then in the public mind that the C.B.C. costs them a lot of money and that the private stations are subsidizing the C.B.C., and that if there is something that can be easily changed then the private stations would be financially better off because he was not helping out the National public system. Now, from the information which has been put before you it is quite indicative that the situation is in the reverse. It would be better in our opinion if the

Members of Parliament knew that through the annual report of the C.B.C.

MR. COYNE: Just on the same page, Mr. Wismer, in the following paragraph, you are referring to - I believe you touched on this a little earlier where you say:

"The Board of Governors should establish its own enforcement branch charged with enforcing the Board's regulations, and responsible directly to the Board of Governors."

Now, I believe Mr. Dunton told us that in one sense they have that procedure at the moment, the station relations and broadcast regulations department reports to the General Manager on matters of station relations who reports to the Board of Governors direct in respect of the enforcement of regulations.

MR. WISMER: Well, far be it from me, and I think this would go for the whole Canadian Labour Congress, we are not here to try to tell the C.B.C. how to run its internal corporate business, but what has appeared to us is that that arrangement is not too sound, if you have a department which is in two pieces, the station relations, which presumably has to get the private broadcaster to do certain things for the C.B.C. and another part of it with men in it who go over to the same private broadcaster and tell him he is not carrying out the regulations made by the Board of Governors of the C.B.C. In a case like that you are not likely to get the enforcement of the regulations that you should.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not put your public relations and legal relations under the same management.

MR. WISMER: That is it, there is a difference in approach, there is a difference in responsibility. No question that this station relations department must be tremendously important in the C.B.C. considering the private and public relation dove-tailing, but it is just as important in the public interest that regulations be enforced, and to do that it seems reasonable to us to suggest that a separate department all together, we are not trying to divorce these people from management in the matter of pay and allowances and those things, but insofar as the work they do that they be directly under the Board of Governors and report directly to the Board of Governors. We have heard suggestions, perhaps you have, about enforcement of the regulations, there should be a separate regulatory board. It is our thinking that they are not too well enforced, and would like to have them better enforced.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Have you any proof of that, of them not being enforced? I think we have to be specific and not make general allegations. Is there any proof of laxity on the part of the C.B.C. in enforcing their regulations?

MR. WISMER: I must make a suggestion to the Commission, but may I make it after the coffee break?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think we might do that. The specific point Mr. Stewart has in mind is as to a specific statement.

MR. WISMER: I have a specific thing in mind but I would like to consult with my associates.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, we will break for ten minutes.

---Intermission.

(Next Page No.837)

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wismer, I am sorry the coffee break was lacking in coffee.

MR. WISMER: Well, it was enjoyable jut the same, sir.

I said I would try to answer Mr. Stewart after the break. What I wanted to do was to consult with those who are here from our affiliated organizations. And while I submitted the brief to you they have the information as to violations of the regulations and they will present it to you. Because they will present it to you from their organizational knowledge I felt, perhaps, it would not do for me to start making some general remarks.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you prefer we will get that in order---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: As we go through the country.

THE CHAIRMAN: As we go through the country.

MR. WISMER: Yes, I am assured from some of representatives of the affiliated organizations and our association, they will put it before you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will hear them on your statement that the Board of Governors too often fail to enforce the regulation. That is the information we will get from your affiliated associates?

MR. WISMER: Yes. I want to explain a few brief points. It is a matter of legislation with our affiliated organizations.

I want to raise one point, to make the suggestion that perhaps your Commission might employ

some competent people to monitor the stations carefully some place during the period of your work.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have already done so.

MR. WISMER: I am sorry, I was late

THE CHAIRMAN: No, there is a programme analysis made, whether it will actually take the form of specific monitoring has not been decided. But there is work being done by the staff of the Commission on the question of programme content for both public and private stations.

MR. WISMER: I may say, sir, we make this suggestion to you because many of our people suggest to us that there is an increasing length of time in the commercials, which seems to be to us a violation of the regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN: I hope we will get the same answer to that from our own studies and from the further information from your affiliated organizations.

Yes, Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Wismer, would you turn to the next section of your brief, in which you deal with the monopoly question, and particularly on page 13, in the final paragraph, where you say:

"We ask you to recommend in your report that all such monopolies be broken up and that the law be amended, as necessary, to prevent any monopolies of this kind developing in the future."

Now, I take it what you mean is an outright

prohibition of all common ownership, particularly of newspaper facilities and radio facilities?

MR. WISMER: That is quite correct. And especially is it true, at the top of page 13, in the second paragraph, it is important in this connection with Kingston, Peterborough, Hamilton, Regina, London and St. John, N.B. are all one paper cities. In other words, one paper controls the radio station and T.V. station. We consider that -- not necessarily it has-- but is capable of suppressing the news or views. And, at least, there should be a break between the newspaper and the radio - T.V. in order to have an opportunity if the news doesn't reach you or the views do not reach you through one it will through the other.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On the other hand, Mr. Wismer, monopoly can be interpreted in any way you want to put it. And in the case of say, all those places, insofar as radio is concerned, outside radios could get in there, quite easily into London, St. John, Peterborough or Kingston. So, there is an element of protection there, at least. The same may not be true of television, I don't know, because of the rather limited radius television has. But in radio they have the opportunity of listening to other stations, and that in itself is public protection, I should think.

MR. WISMER: I would amount to some public protection, but we feel that the existence of newspaper, radio and T.V. all in one hookup, it may be possible for radio to reach, say, Peterborough, but whether it would be for T.V.---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That is the point I made, with television it might not be possible

MR. WISMER: And whether or not it may also be possible with the Metropolitan Toronto newspapers to get to Peterborough, you would have to have an established circulation of that paper. You would have opportunity within that monopoly to restrict news and view. And we think that is quite an important thing. As a matter of fact, we had an example of that sort of thing that required a good deal of public pressure in order to get them to talk about a situation in the CHEX station. We are satisfied that the reason was this monopolistic tieup.

THE CHAIRMAN: You used a bad example, I was born in Peterborough and go back there quite often, and know quite a bit about it. I take it you are worried about the problem of the various agencies of main communication being in one hand?

MR. WISMER: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, Mr. Stewart, they get two other television stations without too much difficulty, and certainly radio stations, and certainly metropolitan newspapers. But your main concern would be of some item of particularly local news?

MR. WISMER: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: But would not any such limitation get into the outside circulations that are coming in? For example, general national or international news? I don't think the common ownership would interr-

upt that, that is in Peterborough.

MR. WISMER: We took Peterborough, not because of the radio station, and not because you originated there, but I deliberately picked one where some other media could reach there. St. John is more isolated, T.V.-wise and newspaperwise. But even in Peterborough the local situation could be suppressed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I see.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Wismer, on this point, and following it along a little, I understand that one, Perhaps, one of the reasons why some of these monopolies situations you speak of have arisen is, because it could happen, particularly in smaller communities, that either the owner of the local newspaper or the owner of the local radio is the only person applying for a license, or the only person able to raise the financial resources to apply for a license, or the only person who has the experience and competence to operate a station? Is it not possible that if these monopolies, as you call them, were subjected to outright prohibition you might have circumstances where the result was simply to deny that community any radio or television facilities at all?

MR. WISMER: Well, on the general point, perhaps, there may be some localities in Canada where this conditions exists, where the only people capable financially, and otherwise, would be the newspaper going into the radio business or the radio business going into T.B. That may be possible in some communities in Canada.

But, there have been representations made to you, I understand there were indications that there are

all kinds of people, if given the opportunity, will get into private T.V.

Page 843 follows.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think in fairness those reports were confined mainly to the very large centres. I think Mr. Coyne's question is going towards the availability of people willing to engage in this business of radio or television, particularly television in the smaller communities.

MR. WISMER: I might say that my information is that there were two applications for the television licence in Peterborough, there was another group prepared to obtain a licence and proceed.

MR. COYNE: Of course, even in circumstances where there are two applicants it might be possible, might it not, that for good and sufficient reasons of competence or experience or what have you that the second applicant was not a suitable person to operate the station and provide the service?

MR. WISMER: I give you that, but I suggest to you that our position is that as a policy we should try to avoid this sort of thing if it is possible. I think this, there seems to be, I assume there is some sort of an affinity between newspapers, radio and television operation, whether it is because they are all money makers I am not sure, but perhaps there is so much money to be made out of a newspaper it is not too hard to finance a radio station and after you get the radio station you go ahead and get a television station, and where you go from there I do not know. I think also this is important, Kingston, Peterborough, Hamilton, Calgary, Regina, London, St. John, Sherbrooke, and even St.

John's, Newfoundland, are centres of substantial effort, they are fair sized, there is a good deal of industry in all of them. There must have been people in all of those places with the ability to raise the funds and the ability to gather around them the capable people to operate either a radio station or television station.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That is quite all right but if, as I understand you are suggesting, some kind of a regulation be put in to stop such practice as this, well, if such a regulation is put in it could not be put in in such a way as to discriminate against certain centres; then the difficulty would arise and that is what Mr. Coyne is after.

MR. COYNE: Really the point I was getting at was this, you mentioned a moment ago that as a policy this should be aimed at, that is, the divorcement of newspaper ownership from radio ownership but that is a different thing from saying that the combination should be prohibited by law.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to put it this way, is being a newspaper publisher an actual complete disability against getting a radio or television station or is it merely just a black mark against you?

MR. WISMER: Well, it is interesting to find that it is in these more thickly populated areas where the ability for someone other than a newspaper owner to have done this, where it seems to have occurred, and in the smaller places we have not

got evidence that this happens.

MR. COYNE: In the smaller places, that is smaller places than Kingston, Peterborough, Hamilton and Regina?

MR. WISMER: Well, anywhere where you cannot find people capable of doing this.

MR. COYNE: Do you object to this co-ownership in any circumstances or only in the situation that you speak of where there are one-paper cities? For instance, in Toronto do you feel that the same objection applies to the ownership of a radio station by a newspaper?

MR. WISMER: Not to the same extent as we do in the areas where it is apparent there is only one newspaper and these people, either in family relationships or in some other way, own and control radio and TV. We are not suggesting they have to divorce the whole three, it is a matter of divorcing the newspaper from the operation of radio and TV.

MR. COYNE: So, there is some element of competition, if you like; you want at least two persons concerned with the communication outlets in each of the communities?

MR. WISMER: Well, if the newspaper refuses my story I at least have someone else to go to, not the same person in a new office.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Wismer, turning now to page 14 to your section dealing with licensing of private radio and television stations you say, towards the bottom of the page:

"The CBC Board of Governors should exercise much greater control and vigilance over these stations."

These are the private stations.

"The promises of services, or programme quality and so forth made by the private stations when seeking a licence should be kept. The CBC Board of Governors should see to it that they are kept."

Now, do you know of any instances where there have been specific promises of service and programme quality which promises have not been kept? Are you thinking of specific instances?

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be that this will fall within the same point you made on the other example.

MR. WISMER: I could make a general statement but this represents the composite thinking of our people and they have the information in which they can give you specific cases, and perhaps that would be more useful to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will get it there.

MR. COYNE: Then, turning the page where you speak of the circumstances in which you think private television stations should be licensed in cities where there is already a CBC station, and, turning to No. 3, a licence should not be granted unless these conditions exist, and No. 3 is:

"The private station is able to provide as much live programming and employ as much Canadian talent as the

CBC station either by producing such programmes itself or by purchasing programmes at actual cost from the CBC.

"4. The percentage of imported programmes does not exceed the percentage on the CBC station."

Now, the question I would ask you is this, is this not largely a question of economics? The CBC has told us that the cost of producing Canadian programmes is such, certainly network programmes, that they cannot obtain back from the sponsors sufficient sums to meet the cost of production so that Canadian production is only possible by virtue of a public subsidy. Now, assuming that to be so and for that very good reason the private station was only in a position financially without subsidy to provide, say, 25 per cent Canadian programmes, whereas the CBC with public subsidy can provide 55 per cent, do you say in those circumstances that the station should not be licensed?

MR. WISMER: I would like to suggest it to you this way, there is only so much money which is going to be spent commercially on TV programmes, these stations go up in the bigger areas, the more thickly populated places where money is available for this purpose, but it is the same money and it either is going into the CBC where it is going now or it is going to be divided between the CBC and the new private television station.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interrupt you but I think there are many people who would argue

with you about the basic premise that there is only so much money for TV advertising. I think the argument goes that in a sense there is only so much money available for advertising but if you look at the finance changes in percentage, in terms of sales dollar, or whatever it is you apply to it, it changes quite materially but within the pool of advertising money, there is said to be a very heavy competition going on between the newspapers, the national magazine advertisers, the radio and television, and this competition plays within the different media, which makes it impossible to say that there is only so much TV money.

MR. WISMER: Yes, though is it not also reasonable to assume that a company which at the moment is not prepared to pay one hundred per cent of the cost of a TV programme from the CBC but still pays the 55 per cent or 60 per cent, whatever the percentage may be, if you set up or license a private TV station, admittedly this produces twice as much time and produces opportunities for advertising on TV, which did not exist before, and I assume the elasticity of that sort of thing, but supposing the type of programme allows the private station to sell it at one hundred per cent of cost and that cost is half of the CBC programme cost, is it not fair to assume that some of the money now being spent with the CBC is going to be spent with the private station?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly there would be some relationship between them.

MR. WISMER: Now, what we are concerned

with, we are not going to have -- they have a CBC station, we are not talking about where there is a private station, this is where there is a CBC station, and if you are going to license another station you look at the situation to see it is not going to cause financial difficulties to the CBC television station and also to try to assure that it is not going to produce a type of programme which is inferior to the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think phrased that way, I notice you use the words "will not be unduly lessened by the competition", which, of course, gives you some notion there may be an impact from this, but it would not be in the way you have phrased Section 3 now in amplification of the statement here. In other words, you take account of the question of not a seriously inferior programme emanating as a result of it, either in terms of quality or in terms of context.

MR. WISMER: Well, my associates tell me it is possible to operate TV on the very cheap and we are trying to avoid that in setting up that kind of thing directly in competition with the CBC where we are going to have trouble enough supplying sufficient money to keep a high level of programme.

MR. COYNE: On the other hand, assuming that the licence is only granted a station where it does not unduly lessen the CBC revenues, is it not likely that if you, in relation to that condition, if you place some arbitrary percentage of the amount of Canadian programming that a private station

must come up to, if you fix that at an uneconomical level surely the only people who suffer are the public because they will pick out the second or alternative programme and certainly the Canadian programming or Canadian talent or anything else does not benefit?

MR. WISMER: Well, if it were ---

MR. COYNE: Are you not really thinking in terms of getting as much Canadian programming as is possible?

MR. WISMER: We want the highest level of Canadian programming we can get, but we do not call Canadian programming a mass running of kinescope film.

MR. COYNE: Supposing a film was produced in Canada?

MR. WISMER: Well, if it is produced in Canada and the re-run provides artists with earnings, all right. I would like to say in connection with this, if I may, that this harks back to the business of setting up private networks. If we were to allow a private network of TV stations it would seem to us the step would be in Southwestern Ontario, in the most profitable place, that would be the most attractive place to have such a network, if we allowed that how can we avoid a serious impairment of CBC revenue?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly we have had a good deal of evidence from the CBC that they would expect there would be such impairment.

MR. COYNE: Turning now to page 18, the second paragraph, you say:

"In handling controversial topics on both radio and television, we think the CBC has allowed itself to be caught up in the modern trend towards conventionalism, conformity and uniformity."

That is very interesting but I wonder if you might like to elaborate a little upon what you have in mind there and how this may be counteracted?

MR. WISMER: Well, we feel, in all fairness to the CBC, it is a public body and it has been cautious in the way of controversy, in discussion and controversial subjects, and it is not a serious criticism of the CBC. But, on the other hand, we think opinion should be expressed alone. The position is quite clear in the next paragraph which is the straight quotation from the White Paper, and we feel it would perhaps improve the discussion of important issues in Canada. I am not talking about political issues but other than that, that the one person be allowed to say his piece. I do not raise this as the only example, but too often we were confronted with the situation that they could not put on a labour programme unless they had management, that is, they must have both sides, and to the extent you have it you may have an interesting discussion but no one really gets his point across and the problem needs discussion, why he acts in a certain way or does business in a certain way or why an organization feels things should be adjusted.

THE CHAIRMAN: You probably have more

competent spokesmen too.

MR. WISMER: We have a lot of spokesmen.

THE CHAIRMAN: But what you are really saying is that the CBC has been too timid, is that it?

MR. WISMER: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Well, turning to page 19, and this really refers again to the question we have discussed about breaches of the regulations. You say:

"We would also draw your attention to the fact that both the CBC and the private stations are violating a previously established policy in regard to the use of recordings on evening programmes. This deprives musicians of employment."

Now, I believe Mr. Dunton commented on this the other day with reference to the use of recorded programmes in the evening, and if I understood him correctly he indicated there just was not very much they could do about it, that they had to permit recorded programmes in the evening because otherwise, in the extreme case, they might drive the private stations out of business and if that happened it would not increase opportunities for employment of Canadian musicians or other performing talent.

MR. WISMER: Well, I might say that the Musicians' Union is an affiliate of the Congress, they have pretty strong views in this matter and we had better hear them on it. They do not agree with the Chairman of the Board of Governors.

THE CHAIRMAN: To raise a question as to

whether there might not be really two problems involved here in a question of the use of recordings, I am not sure of this, but we have heard that there are some new techniques developing in this art, visual tape and so forth, which are coming into the picture as well as the kinescope, but there is a certain problem arising in this country from the difference in time zones and the possible necessity of using recordings for the purpose of getting the programmes out at the right time.

MR. WISMER: I might say on that, I do not think our people are concerned about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is my whole point, there is a difference in this question of using a recording which you see more often in the radio field, you are talking about the disc jockey type of operation when you are really criticizing the recording, but I take it that the view of your organization would not be opposed to the modern and legitimate use of new mechanical technology developments which make for a better programme, of, let us say, Canadian content.

MR. WISMER: I think I would be safe in saying that is the general position of our people. We are not standing in the way of technological development, we are concerned about our share of employment and earnings.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see, but you do recognize, and perhaps your affiliates will have something to say about it, the different kinds of recordings that can be used.

MR. WISMER: I am sure they will.

THE CHAIRMAN: One is of a straight canned sort and the other is a way of sending programmes out to the country. Of course, when you get to the area such as we were talking about this morning, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, that is a practical matter, you are definitely committed to recordings, they cannot be just gramophone records but they are recordings of programmes in order to get them out to people who otherwise would not get anything.

MR. WISMER: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we leave that subject ---

MR. WISMER: One point I would like to make is, we have a completely live show, that is one of the things the Musicians' Union will speak to you about, we have a completely live show except for the music.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is quite a different matter, that is using the straight recorded music. I am talking about where you have a live show in Toronto which in order to put it out at Whitehorse you have to put it on a recording.

MR. WISMER: I am certain they are not going to object to that.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 23, Mr. Wismer: I believe I have some questions on the production field, I think we have pretty well covered them, but you see at the top of the page:

"Despite some suggestions to the contrary, it does not cost more to provide

programmes in Canada than abroad."

I am just wondering whether that is, strictly speaking the point. No one has suggested to us that, for instance, a spectacular by being a little less spectacular does not cost less in Canada than it does in the United States, but what Mr. Dunton said was, it did not cost sufficiently less for the cost to be recovered from advertisers who have such a much smaller market in which to advertise than in the United States. In other words, it was put to us this way, that a programme, with a manufacturer in the United States with a very large turnover may be able to spend \$50,000 on a programme; a Canadian manufacturer, with a much smaller market, could not afford to spend \$15,000.

MR. WISMER: I do not think that is the point we were trying to make; the point I think we were trying to make is that the CBC in its television programmes with the artists and technicians and others available to it have actually been able to produce excellent programmes at much lower cost than the United States.

MR. COYNE: But still not able to recover, so far as the commercial programmes are concerned, just not able to recover the cost of this excellent programme from other sources?

MR. WISMER: I understand that is true. We are not talking about how much they can recover, I do not know if the United States people recover all the cost of their extravaganzas, but our belief, and I want to make a further point on this, our people in Canada apparently are capable with less rehearsal

time and so on to produce excellent shows which allows CBC to operate. Now, I think we should make this point here -- it may be better to leave it to the financing, but I think it comes more naturally here, that it is true that much of this production is being done in very, very adverse conditions, and in thinking about finances I think the Commission ought to consider that while we have wonderful broadcasting equipment and wonderful people who are capable of doing these things, the buildings and the facilities for the production of the programmes are far from adequate, in fact, they are very, very poor."

MR. COYNE: And probably add to the cost by reason of being so poor in efficiency?

MR. WISMER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That was covered when Mr. Dunton was before us, and I think probably he is in entire agreement with your views because of the number of locations in various bigger centres not only adds to CBC costs but adds to the discomfort of the artists themselves, so I would say from what Mr. Dunton and Mr. Quimet said when they appeared here, that they have that very much in mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think now is as good a time as any to state that we are hopeful, as a Commission, to see for ourselves some of these physical conditions of which you are speaking, as we go across the country starting tomorrow.

MR. WISMER: I hope when you do you

remember that the CBC and the CLC were in complete agreement that they be improved.

MR. COYNE: Just a little further down the page you make the statement that preserved programmes should be subject to a substantial tariff based on the original production costs of the programme. Now, that specific suggestion is, I think, new to us, and I wonder if you could give us any specific ideas, if you have them, as to how this tariff would be applied. For instance, would it apply if a film programme came in over the CBC microwave, would that be an importation to which the tariff would apply or would it only apply if the film were physically brought into Canada and shown over Canadian networks or stations? Any ideas you care to develop on this point would be helpful.

MR. WISMER: Well, take the easy one which is that you actually import the film. We are looking at the physical thing and apply a duty on its value. What we suggest is that duty be applied on the cost of producing that article. In other words, protect our artists and our broadcasting system in Canada by applying a protection against the actual cost of producing that show. Since we would have to put up a whole show in this country as an alternative to it, it is not an alternative to buy another film; if we are going to maintain employment and a high level of programming in Canada we must have live talent in front of the camera and to protect them adequately we ought to levy a duty

against the cost of producing this alternate show from Chicago, Pittsburgh or wherever it has originated.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would you say the same would go for live shows that have been produced in, say, New York or Chicago, which are incidentally being seen here in Canada?

MR. WISMER: I suggest that is a slightly different thing since the CBC itself has perhaps got some kind of arrangement for operating that within its own network as the importation of a show, it has a preserved programme which exists and can be used by the CBC itself or the private stations or what not. We are not looking at it actually as a protection for the system ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Have you any idea what the present tariff is on the importation of films for the movies, for instance, because to me that seems to parallel the implication of motion picture programmes into this country. Have you any idea?

MR. WISMER: No, I am sorry, I have not.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have another question arising from this same suggestion. Do you not think you would be running into a little inconsistency in putting a tariff against the imported programmes, whether they extend to live shows or not they are imported, and at the same time you make the recommendation in your brief that we should seek to improve our export markets in television shows and the like? The point I am getting to is, in the history of tariff negotiations it has not been

easy to put a tariff on against the United States, and at the same time succeed in expanding your exports to the United States. There is a certain reciprocity in this matter.

MR. WISMER: I agree with you. The suggestion which we have that the CBC should sell programmes abroad comes from our people with the feeling that there are excellent CBC shows which can be sold abroad and they should be; this should be promoted. We did not think of it in the terms in which you are thinking, I agree with you it is a two-way thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that perhaps leads us very definitely into another matter. It may be one Mr. Coyne was coming to anyway, but I shall try it out. You all realize this is quite a serious financial problem, this matter of the financing of the CBC and broadcasting generally, and we are all concerned, I think, as taxpayers and that problem is a fairly big problem to Canada, which Mr. Coyne has touched on, and that is, you have an efficient product, one you can afford with such a limited market and restricted by the relative smallness of the population, we are scattered over a large area. In other industries that particular problem has been eased or solved by expanding the total market by export, which is a thing you suggest, and so far this is a commodity that has not had substantial tariff in either direction. It does appear that there is quite a shortage of supply in other countries so that there may be a demand for the Canadian

product which, if it is good enough, should be able to command a market. We were told that one of the limiting factors arises in the terms of labour agreements, that it did restrict the policy, the present policy to export these products, these programmes, which have something to do with the different rates, and I do not think would question that there should be different rates between the purely sort of one-shot presentation of a programme and the multiple production of the programme either within Canada or outside. Apparently for similar United States programmes coming into Canada there are not these problems arising from the form of the labour agreements. As far as we can see now, I want to make it clear it is a complicated step and we have not nearly begun to get the facts, but I begin to wonder whether it is a question on which we can ever get all the facts. I doubt if it is. It occurs to me to be a question for collective bargaining having regard to these international factors.

MR. WISMER: That is what I would say.

THE CHAIRMAN: What I am asking is, do you think that organized labour as represented by your Congress would be ready and willing to sit down and examine this whole question with the CBC and possibly private employers to see if a solution can be found to lead to an extension of this export if it is being inhibited at the moment by the present terms of labour agreements.

MR. WISMER: I cannot say that because I

am not in a position to speak for the affiliates, the collective bargaining is done by the affiliated organizations, but I will say this, they are all reasonable people and these negotiations come up from year to year and if the CBC and other people with whom they have contracts can show what the real problem is, I am sure in negotiation these things can be considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: And remove a natural stumbling block to getting into the export market. It is not our business to work it out.

MR. WISMER: Well, I could not say we could do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we should know there is this problem of inhibiting the export which you have suggested in your brief.

MR. COYNE: Well, I just have one or two more questions, and one of them is a reversion for a moment to that tariff suggestion, would you not regard it as likely that the effect of the tariff on United States programmes would be further to increase the financial difficulties the CBC faces, because I take it that you would not suggest the CBC should not bring in any foreign programmes. I think the public of Canada would demand that they bring in a certain proportion of both American programmes and programmes from European countries. Now, if the demand and the public interest is such that programmes, some programmes of that kind should come in, are you not just increasing the financial cost of doing it by imposing a tariff on such importations?

MR. WISMER: Well, let me say, we suggested, I was just looking back but I cannot find it quickly, the foreign content of network programmes should not exceed 40 per cent and on single station programmes, 60 per cent. That was the level at which we thought it was fair that the public would see programmes that they wanted to see, and yet our people would be kept on a reasonable level of employment. Now, as to the actual increase in costs, we have to admit it would increase the cost in that respect, but we were not thinking in terms of producing revenue out of this proposition.

MR. COYNE: Perhaps an indirect result is working in the 40 per cent and 60 per cent, the cost of producing this imported programme is increased, then the available funds, the funds available to the CBC and others to produce local programmes are correspondingly diminished, but is there some solution to that or would you make some suggestion on that aspect of it?

MR. WISMER: Could we talk about this financial angle together rather than just have a piece of it there because I realize this is the toughest job you have to do, but I do not think it is an impossible one.

THE CHAIRMAN: We hope it is not, but it is one which we need all the help we can get. You want to move to the general financing?

MR. WISMER: In making these suggestions I would say we were not expecting this on the other

hand to bankrupt the CBC. On the one hand it would be an inhibitor, a deterrent to the continued importation of film at the expense of our own people being unable to work and produce live shows. After all, the CBC is in a unique position, it is the agency within this country that can develop more music and more literature, more plays, more theatre, and I think radio has done that, I think we can point to the way it did that, and television with its impact can do even more.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Have you any idea, Mr. Wismer, of the extent to which the CBC is carrying film now for presentation on the network?

MR. WISMER: No, I have not, the word from behind me is that it is considerable.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Coyne's question leads to this, that from the standpoint of the CBC a tariff such as you suggest might increase their costs, might thereby reduce the amount of money available for their own Canadian production of programmes, and whether the overall effect of it would be good or bad, even from the point of view from which you are putting it forward, is a little hard to be very sure of.

MR. WISMER: Well, I am not sure that I go along with you completely, Mr. Chairman, to the extent that they have to pay a bit more for the programmes which they import, they will have a fixed budget, and, therefore, they have no more for that, but if they pay this fairly severe tariff then this consolidated revenue fund picks that up and has it available to assist the CBC or someone on the other side.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see it is a pretty complicated matter, but it is an interesting one and it is the first time we have heard it.

MR. COYNE: I was coming to the financial side of it, and turning to page 24 where the suggestions are summarized, perhaps I can just ask one or two general questions. First of all, with regard to the commercial revenue which the CBC derives and which you include in your computation of the funds that may be available, do you think that the CBC's commercial activities should be extended, present commercial activities should be extended or reduced or kept at about the present level? In other words, have you any particular ideas as to really from the point of view of programming whether the commercial activities of the CBC should be changed in scope, in any detail to what they are now?

MR. WISMER: I do not think we thought in terms of changing their activities, no one wants to have the screen cluttered up all the time with commercials, but, at the same time, we recognize that there is a source of revenue there. We also made the point earlier that we did not want them to have to rely on commercial revenue. In other words, if a programme had been produced and it is a good programme, it is worth seeing, and nobody wants to pay for it commercially; they should still be able to produce that programme. In other words, the CBC as a public body is responsible for getting a programme produced, a good programme, but for some

reason or other has not someone who wants to sponsor it. Surely, it should not be stopped revenue-wise unless it is a great error in judgment; we are not talking if about that, but it is a good programme and there is a place for it during the day's broadcasting it should be possible to do that apart from the fact that it is not a commercially sponsored programme. There should be enough money to keep the network going without commercial money.

MR. COYNE: I take it in general terms you agree with the CBC's activities?

MR. WISMER: We have not any quarrel with them.

MR. COYNE: The next question I have, and it arises out of your suggestion that revenues be provided by a statutory grant. Would you feel that to provide the funds to the CBC out of general revenue would be unacceptable to or should not be imposed upon people who do not get the television service either because of the fact they do not want to own a TV set, they cannot afford to own a TV set or they are in an area where there is not good service. If it comes out of general revenue these people will be contributing to the service without personally or directly benefiting from it.

MR. WISMER: I suppose under the same basis we can recommend taxes on aircraft tickets and railway tickets. The Department of Transport provides a lot of service in this country out of general revenue, but a lot of people do not use them.

The CHAIRMAN: I think probably a difference is that there is such a heavy content of entertainment in the television programmes. In other words, it is one thing to build up a transportation system for the movement of goods and services and everybody has to pay for it, but a different thing to ask somebody who is not interested in a certain kind of entertainment or unable to get it to make a contribution to it.

MR. WISMER: I understand that argument but there are certain other parts of it that should be considered. The first is, there has been a very rapid increase in population who have apparently invested in TV receiving sets and all the indications are it is going on, and they almost seem to buy the set in anticipation of the availability of a programme. Now, it may be said this is entertainment, but it appears that the people want to be entertained. I think that it is important in relation to the second point, which is that our every effort has been and generally the desire is for more leisure time, more and more leisure time to the extent that if we are realistic in saying that is a trend and that is the way we are going, this medium provides something useful and entertaining for that leisure time. We now have over two million sets in operation and owned in Canada and if this development keeps going on I think it is correct, this figure the CBC used about the percentage.

THE CHAIRMAN: They can reach now, I think, 80 per cent of the population.

MR. WISMER: Yes, and in the next three or four years it will be between 90 per cent and 100 per cent. Is it not stretching a point to say we can reach that area -- we are not reaching that area until we can say for the purpose of taxation that we are covering the whole economy.

(Page 868 follows)

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In this tabulation you have made, you have related the statutory grant to the number of television and radio sets in the home?

MR. WISMER: I think we are a little out there with what the CBC said. We said \$3.00, per radio home.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: No, but you are referring at least to the number of radio and television per home. Why would you suggest a statutory grant rather than a license fee from each owner or a radio or television?

MR. WISMER: Well, we have had a lot of experience with an attempt to collect radio licenses in this country, and I think the tax gathering machinery of the Federal Department of Revenue is much more efficient than ever was the radio license gathering machinery of the Department of Transport. And it is an annoyance, and people like to enjoy evading that fellow when he comes to collect their money. Maybe it would be simpler, maybe it would be more equitable, but it doesn't work. we just object to nuisance taxes and try to avoid paying them every step of the way.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You understand, handling it this way you are adding to the budgetary cost of the government without improving the revenue, so ultimately somebody is going to pay it, and it is going to be you and me.

MR. WISMER: No doubt about that. But I also think this, may be these figures look large, and they are large, individually, all by themselves, but related, for instance, to this voluntary investment by

by the public of 750 millions---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Those figures were mentioned.

MR. WISMER: To have the programme. Surely these people are prepared to pay the price of a newspaper to get the programme. After all, when we say \$15.00, a year, you might get the public reaction that says that is a lot of money, but it costs \$15.00, a year for a newspaper.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wismer, have you given any consideration to what could be any objection, any possible danger in this point, the same general point but taking it from quite a different angle. Mr. Stewart has shown it from the standpoint of developing a general revenue body, if a people did not realize that they are contributing to this for something they are buying as service. Continuing it differently, is there any danger at all in this very important area of public information and broadcasting, is there any danger in the statutory grant in itself, the license fee which comes from the man who gets the service and pays in for the service ---I don't suggest there is---I am raising the question, the sort of thing I am worried about, is this getting the government into the propaganda business? That is what I am interested in.

MR. WISMER: Well, not basically. We have had a quarter of a century of experience that parliament has been responsible for radio, and now television, and by and large, I think the radio committees of the House of Commons have dealt with the situation fairly objectively. I think the very fact they were able to find

a reasonable formula on political broadcasting would indicate they were not using the CBC, as you say, as a propaganda machine for the government. I think there is a tendency in this country to object to it so strenuously it is not politically strong.

The reason for suggesting a statutory grant, from our point of view, if you have to have this separate vote by parliament every year it is a little difficult to know, you have to manage and plan ahead for a programme, the whole operation. There has to be some period---we all have this trouble---we cannot all say five years from now we are going to be in a spot. There must be some policy.. To say this, we have established that, we are going to get so much money with the growth of population and television users, so this year we are doing this. And have the engineers and others planning ahead for next year or even a year beyond that. I am not now talking about the political control, but from the financial position and the operational position. You don't know what parliament is going to do for you next year, you might find yourself with a deficit of money and all kinds of things without the money, turning out a programme and no way of producing it.

But the term of parliament is four or five years, and if the position is unsound there is an opportunity for the whole public to say, "If that is the way this government wants its agency to operate, we want another government."

THE CHAIRMAN: The thing that concerned me and my fellow Commissioners up until now there has been

relatively a small amount provided by way of statutory grant to the entire money for radio and television in Canada. You cannot be too absolute in these matters, but most of it, at least, has come from something that had some relationship to the viewing audience, either in the form of the old license fee or in the form of the excise tax earmarked and passed over because you bought a set and, so to speak, paying your admission fee. That is getting away from the business of parliament having to pass on grants, whether you do it once a year or once over five years. The problem of parliamentary politics entering into this area. I think it is terribly important in the field of public information.

MR. WISMER: It is a little difficult for me, sir, to make any counter suggestion, because I speak for an organization. But I was wondering, if what you had in mind, we should, perhaps, do what we did under the social security setup, because essentially it was direct from the public treasury, to let everyone know what he was paying into as part of his tax, his natural tax. He knew what he was paying.

One thing we are concerned about, if you are going to have this minimum figure, essentially it will get bigger, perhaps, we must get it from the public treasury. We must get it, basically, the most efficient way commensurate with democratic methods.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we have to get it from the public operating through some legislative device. Of course, with that, it might not come from the public treasury, it might take another license fee, not from

the treasury.

MR. WISMER: I think there is another point that should not escape us. We were sitting across the hall two months ago, we were talking to the Gordon Commission, and they had been hearing from business people and other throughout the country of what is likely to happen in fifteen, twenty, twenty-five years from now. I realize it is only a forecast, but there was so much similarity in the growth of gross national production and income, and so on, that in thinking in these terms isn't it fair to say that 50, 60, 70 or 100 million dollars in real terms, there is no saying how big that works out in gross national product of this country. The taxing power of this country is not established.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you are certainly entitled to point out the different basis on which this may be leveled, but that doesn't go to the point of my question.

MR. WISMER: Despite the wonderful machinery of the Federal government, it doesn't tax everybody. Many of these people who might be considered to be discriminated against because they haven't got a television set, many of those people don't pay taxes either, that is the Federal government, they may pay municipal, and this is the way it should be.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I take it you subscribe to the concern about the importance of the independence of the public broadcasting system free from political interference?

MR. WISMER: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Chairman, those are all the questions I wanted to ask.

THE CHAIRMAN: I only have one other question to ask you, Mr. Wismer, and that is on the availability of talent. Is that something we ought to ask your affiliated unions when we have them before us? I mean, there has been a good deal of evidence both ways, whether there is plenty of Canadian talent available to do better and bigger programmes or whether, in fact, there is a shortage in this field of radio and television depends so much, because of the repeated demands made upon it?

MR. WISMER: Well, I think in fairness I should say this: There is not any limit. There is a limit, but it is not fair to say we are short of talent. I think it is true that as we develop the demand for talent, talent develops. When we get a chance to finance a symphony orchestra in some place other than Montreal or Toronto, the musicians turn up and play in the symphony, and play very well. When we had no theatre television came along and I think we developed the theatre because of that. We have the talent in this country to develop if we have the chance to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think we will probably be asking your associations this question, also.

It has been an interesting afternoon, we appreciate you coming. And for this, thanks go not only to you but to your associates as well.

MR. WISMER: Thank you. It has been a pleasure having been able to appear.

THE CHAIRMAN: This adjourns the Ottawa sittings, and I use the word intentionally. We cannot finish all the briefs that were to be heard in Ottawa this time. As it is likely to turn out, we will do our travelling across the country in the next two months getting most of the hearings completed and coming back to Montreal and doing Toronto. And finally sitting here in Ottawa in the fall, I think probably in the month of September.

At that time we will resume the Ottawa hearings, and try to do something about the acoustics in this room.

---whereupon the hearing adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

ROYAL COMMISSION
ON
BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

WINNIPEG, MAN.

MAY 7, 1956

v. 6

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

The Sittings of The Commission were held at Winnipeg, Manitoba commencing on the 7th day of May, 1956, through to the 9th day of May, 1956.

PRESENT:

THE CHAIRMAN	ROBERT M. FOWLER
COMMISSIONER	EDMOND TURCOTTE
COMMISSIONER	JAMES STEWART

.....

COMMISSION COUNSEL	JOHN M. COYNE
	A.J. deGRANDPRE

.....

SECRETARY	PAUL PELLETIER
-----------	----------------

10:00 A.M.

.....

APPEARANCES:

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Alderman Albert Bennett

Alderman Douglas Chisholm

WINNIPEG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. E. McCormick

Mr. W. Faulder

Mr. R. Brunning

MANITOBA FARMERS UNION

Mr. J. Patterson

Mr. J. N. Galonsky

MANITOBA FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE AND
COOPERATION

Mr. Paul Terko

Mr. J. G. McLean.

GENERAL FACULTY COUNCIL OF UNITED COLLEGE,
WINNIPEG

Dr. W. C. Lockhart

Prof. J. H. S. Reid

Prof. K. W. McNaught

NEWMAN CLUB ALUMNI, UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Mr. Francis Muldoon

Mr. George Goulet

Miss Bertha Vandersteen

Mr. Robert Bennett

Miss Therese de la Giroday

WINNIPEG SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA LTD.

Mr. C. I. Keith, Q.C.

Mr. L. Davis.

RED RIVER T. V. ASSOCIATION

Mr. L. Johnstone.

SUBMISSION OF COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG.

APPEARANCES:

Alderman Albert Bennett

Alderman Douglas Chisholm.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will come to order and begin the hearings of the Commission, Winnipeg. We are all very pleased to be here in Winnipeg and to

arrive at a time when you are not quite as worried about your flood situation as you expected to be. We have been told in the East that we would arrive exactly at the crest of the flood, but I am glad to see this has not happened.

I do not think I need repeat some of the opening statements that I made in Ottawa as they have been pretty well reported, except, possibly, just to emphasize one or two points. We are here to enquire, within the limits of our terms of reference, into the problems of radio and television broadcasting in Canada. We are approaching the problem with no preconceived ideas, with no decisions made, with the desire to get at the issues and find out what the problems are and try to work out some suggestions for their solution. In doing that we have been working on the basis that in general we do not need to have the briefs read in detail. We have read them beforehand and studied them, and we are trying to proceed by way of question and answer after an opening statement summarizing the general position, if that is convenient. On the other hand, on a very short brief, it may be more convenient to read it, in which case that is all right.

I should say a word about the questioning. We are, as I say, enquiring into the whole problem, and we think the best way to proceed is to ask questions of the witness who happens to be before us, and necessarily those problems are to bring out the views on what may be opposing points of view, but

no-one should read into any question the notion that there has been any decision reached by the Commission. In other words, when we are examining a witness from one point of view we may sound as if we were inclined towards the opposite point of view, but when that opposite point of view comes before us we seem to be on the other side again.

I understand the first brief is to be presented on behalf of the Council of the City of Winnipeg, and you, Alderman Bennett, are here to present that, and I understand you are assisted by Alderman Chisholm.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Yes sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am very glad to have you here, and if you will file your brief I think the next number is 34.

EXHIBIT No. 34: Brief of Council of City of Winnipeg.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Royal Commission on Broadcasting, I would prefer to read our brief as it is one that has been passed by Council and it is very short.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: On March 12, the Council of the City of Winnipeg voted unanimously in favour of a resolution, reading:

"Whereas Winnipeg citizens are now served by only one television broadcasting station, CBWT;

And whereas that station, being part of a

"national chain, and committed to coverage of National affairs, cannot possibly serve the varied needs of this busy city;

And whereas the Royal Commission on Broadcasting is now studying such problems and has asked for expressions of opinion concerning them;

Therefore be it resolved that this body present to the Commission on Broadcasting a brief suggesting that competing television broadcasting stations be allowed to operate in Winnipeg as soon as possible"

This brief was therefore prepared, presented to and unanimously approved by Council of the City of Winnipeg, and is now placed before you for your consideration. Of what it amounts to, the Council believes, is an articulation of a widespread public demand. That demand springs from two sources: the desire for a wider choice in programmes; and the needs of business, civic and cultural activities of this growing City.

Aldermen, as you know, are kept pretty well aware of the complaints of their constituents. One complaint, expressed ardently and often, has been the fact that the city of Winnipeg and district has only one television station in Winnipeg. No matter how fine many of the programmes may be, citizens desire the freedom of choice which the present restrictive policy rules out.

This desire for additional television stations has been expressed by the aforementioned resolution, which passed unanimously by the City of

St. James resolution, which it is understood will be placed before you in a brief from that city; by the Manitoba Legislature; and by various other Winnipeg groups.

This public demand is made almost explosive when citizens know that reputable Winnipeg people have applied for, and are ready to operate, additional T.V. Stations in Winnipeg, at no cost to the taxpayer. If Winnipeg had only one T.V. station because it could afford only one, the present situation would be understandable. But when the area is limited to a single channel by Government decree, in a heavily populated district such as this, a growing discontent can be expected.

The Council has been informed that certain other large cities, also restricted to a single Canadian station, have been less vocal in asking for competitive television than Winnipeg has been. In each case, however, it is learned that those cities receive programmes on American channels -- so they do have some alternative choice. This is not so in the local area.

Public demand for freedom of choice, here in Winnipeg, has sometimes taken the form of violent criticism of CBWT, for certain programmes. This has been acknowledged publicly by CBWT officials. Council is convinced that such violent criticism would disappear almost completely if local viewers had something else to turn to when a programme failed to interest. Until such time, it is to be expected that Winnipeggers

will continue, by letter and telephone, to protest violently when a programme offends or displeases them; and to grumble when a programme fails to interest them.

Winnipeg is a rapidly growing industrial city, and should not be deprived of modern merchandising tools such as television.

Just as the four local private radio stations stimulate trade and increase employment and job opportunities, so would additional television stations.

Additional television stations would share the tax burdens, and contribute in that way to the welfare and progress of the city.

Many Winnipeg retailers have been kept solvent in certain periods because of the sale of T.V. sets, and the servicing of them. These service industries are of extreme importance to the area in this period of growth, and it is believed that additional stations would mean an increase in the sale of television receivers.

It must be evident, to everyone, that Winnipeg, the fourth largest market in Canada, is made available by a national T.V. station to manufacturers in United States and Eastern Canada. Indeed, a single station, committed to National Service, makes local viewers almost a captive audience for such manufacturers. They have the best time periods, and the benefit of programme subsidies through the National system.

While it is of course fair that all manufacturers have access to our market, it does not seem

reasonable that they should have it as a monopoly to such a large degree.

Local television stations would give local manufacturers an opportunity to compete on more equal terms in their home market. This has proved true in radio broadcasting and should prove equally true in Television.

Winnipeg is a city of many ambitious and worthwhile community and cultural activities. They all need publicity, news coverage, promotion. CBWT has, within the limitations of its National tie-up, been of great service. Where they have a portion of time available, they have often devoted it to some local cause or activity. But as stated in the resolution, they are committed, during most of the good periods, to the National service.

For that reason, it is felt that the additional television stations would be of wonderful service outside the fields of industry and commerce. They would do as the local radio stations have done so faithfully -- boost local events, give quick and alert news coverage to civic affairs, and serve as avenues of communication when needed. Frequent weather reports; debates on local issues; appeals by blood donor clinics; a hundred matters of vital importance to the citizens would be served by them.

There is a widespread demand for additional T.V. service in Winnipeg.

A single station, committed to National service, cannot handle the vast number of varied community needs, civic, commercial and cultural.

Additional stations would contribute directly in taxes and job opportunities. Winnipeg is always eager to welcome important new industries, and this one would be welcome.

Additional stations would give local manufacturers a more equal chance to compete with Eastern and American manufacturers.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the City of Winnipeg deeply appreciates having the Commissioners as guests here, and all the facilities of City Council are at your disposal. It is hoped your stay is pleasant, and that all citizens cooperate to help you arrive at your recommendations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Alderman Bennett. Do you wish to add anything to the reading of the brief at this stage?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or does Alderman Chisholm?

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Not at present, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: If that is the case, we will go right on with the questions, and I think, Mr. Coyne, you were going to open the questioning this morning.

MR. COYNE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Alderman Bennett, you point out that the reception of television from the United States is not possible in Winnipeg because of the larger distances involved. Could you tell us whether that will always

be so or whether there is any possibility that stations might be built in the United States sufficiently close to the border to permit reception in Winnipeg?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Well, I am a Civil Engineer, not electrical or electronics, so I really could not answer that question. I would imagine that it could be possible if they had high enough towers, or they could pipe it in, or methods of that nature.

MR. COYNE: But as far as you know, there are not any practical plans of any kind on foot at the moment?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: There has been a suggestion of piping it in from one of the American stations, and then paying a fee to have that particular programme put on your T.V. set, but that was merely a thought, I believe, on the part of some business man.

MR. COYNE: I suppose there are no communities of any size in the United States just across the border? You have to go a fair distance to find towns of any size?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Yes, I believe you do. I believe you have to go to Grand Forks, isn't it?

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: That is it.

MR. COYNE: You refer in your brief to widespread public demand in Winnipeg for freedom of choice, and we already have substantial evidence of the wide-

spread nature of this demand in the material that is already filed with the Commission. Could you tell us whether any consideration, by and large, has been given by members of the public to the type of programming that might, in fact, be available to them if there were a second or a third television station in Winnipeg?

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: I think I should answer that. It is very difficult indeed to organize the public so as to say what would you like and what wouldn't you like. Take a programme they showed last night, for instance, called "The Trial"; that may suit ten or twenty percent of the public, but the other eighty percent may not like it at all.

MR. COYNE: Is it fair to assume that if there was another programme that that would satisfy the other eighty or ninety percent?

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Well, out of the eighty or ninety percent, it might satisfy another fifty or sixty percent out of that eighty percent, but if you had an alternative programme, then you would have a yardstick of appreciation, and you could have surveys taken up to find out who were listening to what particular station, as they do in radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that is the sole test, that you really develop a radio programme by means of a gallop poll, or is that the best way to devise it?

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Well, I am not in the radio

broadcasting business.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but this is not a technical question. What I am really thinking of is the basic underlying problem as to whether there is a purpose in the broadcasting function which is not simply giving the people what they ask for. This is getting into dangerous ground, and I recognize the problems, but we have heard it said that there are national values to be served by a radio programme and a television programme. We have heard it said that this is one of the ways in these powerful media of drawing different parts of the country together and informing and advising people of what is going on throughout Canada and throughout the world, and going on to employ Canadian artists and develop artistic and cultural life. This is not just simply your test, of how many happen to be listening.

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Possibly indeed, sir. Therefore, there is basically behind the CBC a feeling that we must develop a certain type of culture which the CBC, in its wisdom, would feel would be good for the citizens. My own feeling is that perhaps there might be a little too much of this feeling as to what is good for the citizens, and therefore that an alternative yardstick, an alternative station which would give a yardstick, is needed, and then the CBC could possibly find by surveys what the people actually want instead of as at present, what is felt is good for them.

MR. COYNE: One of the aspects of this whole television matter that has been brought forcibly before the Commission so far is the very high cost of television, as distinct, if you like, from radio; and in particular we have had representations that to produce programmes in Canada - that is, Canadian programmes - of certainly network calibre, is not a commercial proposition, that there would be very few programmes of that nature if they were not financed or subsidized to some extent by the State, and a further suggestion has been made, or the question is raised as to whether a private station operating commercially without any CBC programmes to fill in this time would be able to provide not really very much of anything except imported American films; is that a consideration you have given any thought to, or that you would care to comment on?

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Yes, sir. You can compare a privately-owned television station to, say, a privately owned radio station. For instance, a matter of some six or eight years ago a radio station started in Winnipeg and all they produced for the first quite considerable period was straight music and news on the hour every hour with advertisements sprinkled in, and I believe they are one of the most listened to radio stations, and if a T.V. station had to start off with simply nothing but canned advertisements and a few odd films, if the public liked that sort of thing, they should be entitled to it. I don't want to deal with specific programmes because that is not fair, but our best time on Sunday night at Winnipeg is about ten

o'clock; everybody is home on Sunday night, and we have been forced to look at programmes that really don't suit more than 20 per cent of the public.

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair to say, Alderman Chisholm, in any event in this present situation where there is only one outlet the citizens of Winnipeg might well regard any alternative programme as better than no alternative programme at all?

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Indeed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne, I would like to be clear as to what the City Council's view is on the nature of this second television station. Do you conceive of it as being a station which will form, as now exists for all television stations, part of the National system, or will it be completely outside the National system?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, it would be part of both. There are certain groups of business men who feel they are ready to invest money in a television station with the idea of making it pay, and one of the premises of the organization is that they would give a great deal more coverage to local events than we now get from CBWT. They would also expect to take certain programmes from the National chain and show them, and, quite frankly, I imagine they would bank very heavily on American films; they would have to for the first few years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask you a couple of

questions on that. If the proposal for this second station -- and I know it is not your personal proposal or that of the Council of the City of Winnipeg, but notwithstanding that we have got you here now and you are the only one we can ask at the moment; I take it the proposal is that that new station would expect to get some national programmes from the CBC?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Yes, they do. Speaking to one or two of the gentlemen who are interested in this, that is one of their plans.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if that is their plan, then I don't see how the statement at the bottom of page 2 of your brief can be defended where you say they are ready to operate additional T.V. stations in Winnipeg at no cost to the taxpayer?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Well, how does the National TV station operate? They have a certain amount of advertising, have they not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, as we were told in Ottawa, the addition of a new television station to the present network would cost the public treasury of the order of \$100,000 a year.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Isn't it logical to assume the cost of a programme is so much, and if certain private stations desire that programme, they pay a certain amount for it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The private stations pay nothing for the programmes they get from the CBC. I am not

trying to trap you in your brief at all, but if the intent is to have a new station supplied in part by National programmes from the CBC, then the statement "at no cost to the taxpayer" is just not so.

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: It is very simple; The CBC could change their system and provide programmes for a certain fixed fee to private stations, for the privilege of piping in the programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, perhaps you are right, but I haven't found any private station coming forward with any such proposition yet. If that was the wish of the private stations we would be very pleased to hear it.

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Well, that is news to me, because I always felt the private stations who used programmes from the CBC paid a subsidy back to the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it is exactly the other way round, and whether you call it a subsidy, and this matter is certainly a complicated one, there is certainly a public cost involved in providing programmes to the private stations, and even with the commercially sponsored programmes which are produced in Canada, the advertiser does not pay the full cost of the productions of those programmes, so there is a content of public money in there as well.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In addition, the

private stations get a portion of the advertising.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a provision for the advertising trust. The other thing I would like to ask you as the representatives of the Council of Winnipeg is, as to what you feel in regard to public responsibility for the nature of programmes? Do you or do you not feel that there is need of some standards - I am not suggesting it with the idea there should be a schoolmasterish method of handing out culture or instruction, but is there an undesirable feature in having complete freedom in the programming, considering the influence that this medium has on everybody and particularly on children? I don't suggest this is so, but I am asking your views on it.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: My view would be that there should be strict government control of programming. That is, of course, a personal view. There is no question about it. That is exercised in radio now, I believe, as to the amount of advertising allowed, and consequently I believe that also should be exercised in the case of private TV.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne, I interrupted your questioning.

MR. COYNE: Not at all, Mr. Chairman. Just one further question, which is somewhat related to the programme matter that we have been speaking of. One of the aims, if you like, in the National Broadcasting system as it is expressed in the present Broad-

casting Act, is the encouragement of Canadian talent and Canadian programming on both the National and the private stations; do you have any views on that subject? Would you care to say whether you think programme content should be controlled with a view to encouraging the development of local performing talent or creative talent even on the private stations?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Well, I believe it should be, yes, that local TV stations would be an excellent medium for developing local talent. I know in Winnipeg here, Mr. Chairman, over the past few years, there have been several outstanding actors, singers, who have been gone down to Toronto. They haven't got a chance here in Winnipeg to express themselves or make any money as entertainers, and I do believe with a TV station here in Winnipeg, it may be a medium whereby we could keep some of our good talent here in Winnipeg. I also believe one of the functions of television should be to encourage young people to enter the entertainment field if they have that capability.

THE CHAIRMAN: And when you say that, you go beyond entertainment to the artistic?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Yes, I include that in it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, on that point we were told - and this is a general question - that certainly not more than 55 percent of the broadcast time in tele-

vision is taken up by the National programming; that therefore there is something of the order of about 45 percent or more time available for local needs and local functions and local stimulation of talent. It may well be that the time on the National programmes is the better advertising time, but that still does not mean that there is not an opportunity within the one-station system for developing some local talent and for doing some local merchandizing. Have you any comments on the existence of that?

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Yes, Mr. Chairman; true, possibly, there is 45 percent available for local time, but unfortunately, the time that is available is not the best listening time. From eight o'clock on in the evening it is practically all of National character.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can understand that being an answer from an advertising point of view. I don't know that it is quite as good an answer from the standpoint of an opportunity for developing these other local requirements and needs that you speak of.

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Well, in answer to that, Mr. Chairman, at night - I don't know on radio surveys how many people listen at a given hour, but I know that I don't get to see a television set until at least ten o'clock at night. Of course, that is my own particular problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any small children?

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Oh, yes, but I just felt that the programmes are National from 8 o'clock on, and the public no doubt look at television in the evening more than in the afternoon.

MR. COYNE: You do point out in your brief that from the point of view of the local advertiser, he regards this as something of a disability, in not having time available at the heavy listening times?

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Doesn't CBWT carry spot announcements even during the National network time in the evening, for example, between programmes?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Yes, they carried the level of the flood up until about a week ago, which was rather interesting to anybody. They broadcast the hockey scores - just a brief flash.

MR. COYNE: What about advertisements - commercial spots?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: That is quite true. The man with the axe comes on.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the Commission, I will have you know.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: No. Yes, I quite agree they do carry that in conjunction with their National programme. There are certain firms in Winnipeg that are represented during the National programming.

MR. COYNE: So that spot announcements are available to local advertisers, but not the sponsorship of programmes during those heavy listening evening hours?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Yes, I would say that is correct.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In your submission you mention the fact that there is a very large percentage - I can't just recall the figure - a very large percentage of the listeners who do not like CBC: in what way can you reach such a conclusion?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Well, if you were an Alderman in Winnipeg, you would find you would have to put a telephone by your bedside. I don't like to mention any particular programme, but some two or three months ago there was a certain opera put on here in Winnipeg that lasted an hour and a half or more, and my phone just rang and rang - the next day too. That has happened on several occasions. Other Aldermen find the same thing too. Winnipeg is a big city; if people do not like anything, they phone and tell you. They won't phone if they like something and say that the programme is good. However, as a result of that sort of thing, and talking to people, you can generally get a sort of a Gallup poll on it. You do get a view when you speak to a certain amount of people as to what is right and what is wrong and what they like or what they don't like, and I can assure you they don't like

opera at ten o'clock at night on a Sunday.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will quote you, without drawing any conclusions, a statement of Joseph Pulitzer, who said any day he published a newspaper and didn't make somebody mad, he regarded that day as a failure.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You also say in the brief that Winnipeggers will continue by letter and telephone to protest violently when a programme "offends": that is a pretty strong word?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: That word "offends", it is strong. There is one particular programme which did offend around Easter. It was sort of an up-to-date crucifixion scene, and I know that many people disliked it. I do not remember the name of the programme, but I know I had several calls from various people of different denominations who thought it was not quite the right thing to put on. They were offended by it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: I may say some people phone because they don't like the blood and thunder pictures, they think their children should not be exposed to them. Well, the only reasonable thing to do is to turn the set off, but I have two children and I know how hard that is.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you did put your finger very squarely, though, on the issue of public

complaints when you say you always get the complaints but you don't very often get the commendations.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: The only people who told me they did like a programme on CBC were two men who said they wanted to get home and see the wrestling on Saturday night.

MR. COYNE: Just turning to the last section of your brief on page 5, where you refer to the need for local services, am I right in thinking that subject to the time qualification that Mr. Chisholm mentioned there is a good deal of time available on CBWT for local originations of one kind or another?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Well, yes, I couldn't quarrel with that statement. I don't know when the TV station in Winnipeg goes on in the afternoon; I seldom get home before five o'clock or six o'clock at night, and I know my daughter, as soon as she comes home from school, turns on the TV. There could be between, say, five and eight o'clock at night certain times when local affairs could be sponsored or handled by CBWT.

MR. COYNE: You say "could be"; are they, in fact?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Yes, they are, in fact. We have our news, our local news, sometimes appeals, local appeals, but we haven't got the great coverage that a strictly local station would give. That is

evident if you consider radio - the four radio stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not really asking for a strictly local station?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: No, we are not, that is true, but certainly if a local TV station started up in Winnipeg, they would, without a question of a doubt, try and develop local interest by televising local affairs. That would be one of the strongest media whereby they could build up their station listeners and also their business.

THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the difficulty is that a proposition based on obtaining some National programmes necessarily involves the availability of those programmes. At the present time the whole National Television Broadcasting Service is made available to the existing CBC station here. You are not going to give any choice if you just pipe the same programme into two stations. What you are really calling for is the development at public cost of an alternative programme service which would, by the way these things go in television, be a pretty substantial cost. Have you any comment on that?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, that would refer to that previous question you asked in pointing out that it was a cost to the taxpayer, in effect. All I can say is that what I stated was a personal view. I have spoken to two gentlemen who are interested in having an alternate TV station here in Winnipeg, and my conclusion from my conversation with

them was that they were prepared to pay for all services that they televised. I believe you will have an opportunity of questioning one or two of them. I notice they will be appearing here in the next two days, and that will be a better opportunity.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, we will ask them. I have one other general question I would like to ask you as responsible Canadian citizens here in Winnipeg: If it does represent an additional cost, the opening of alternative stations, the point has been put to us that the cost is involved in such a thing, and that there are many parts of Canada which have no TV at all at the moment, and the argument they put forward is that for the present coverage is adequate for private stations and public money ought to be devoted to the problem of bringing TV to areas that haven't got any.

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: That is most reasonable. If there are areas which have not CBC coverage of television - and the CBC coverage is really of very good calibre - they should have it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we have a map in which the present coverage of the TV system is marked out, and you would be startled if you saw the number of gaps in the Canadian population that are not now reached by TV. Admittedly, all the more populace areas are, but there are many parts where there are many Canadians who are not, in fact, getting TV service.

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Well, that is very

regrettable, but that is really a subject for the CBC to get cracking on and develop.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it is a subject of money.

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Yes, but would that, in effect, have anything to do with the subject of an additional station in Winnipeg?

THE CHAIRMAN: A great deal, I should say, because if my assumption is correct that the opening of an additional station in Winnipeg involved public money and if, as we all have to admit, the amount of public money that ought to be devoted to this operation is not unlimited, then what, in effect, you are asking for is the expenditure of public money to give you a second TV station before TV is brought to areas that don't have any.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: When you speak of public funds you are speaking only of the particular programmes that would be given to this private station?

THE CHAIRMAN: And the transmission charges and the line charges.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Well, if the private stations are prepared to pay those costs.....?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but it is a cost which, as I understand it - and I could be wrong since I have no technical knowledge about these things - but the original cost to CBC is \$100,000 a station to be put on, and then there are line charges etc., after that for the ordinary operations of television.

If that \$100,000 figure is correct, and Winnipeg together with Toronto, which has an alternative channel available, Vancouver and various other large centres obtain stations, the overall cost would be very heavy, and when you look at the rents the Government are giving now, the amount that the public are paying for the provision of a National system is very very big, and I think I will agree with Mr. Fowler that if alternate stations were built in those places, the distribution of television to those parts of the country not now covered would be retarded a very great deal.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: I grant you they would. I am thinking now of the northern parts of Manitoba as an illustration. It would be a tremendous cost at the present time.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: But here in Manitoba we have a very fine telephone system, and the citizens of Winnipeg pay for the cost of the telephones to rural subscribers. There is no question about that; it is a statement made by our Minister of Public Utilities himself, and I think while we may feel that we are hard done by, still we want that service for all of Manitoba, and I believe as a Manitoban we are all proud of it, and that could apply equally to television for the northern part of Manitoba and Northern Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one other question which is on a slightly different point. Without

being technical about it and understanding the technicalities, there is a physical limitation to the number of available usual channels for television.

ALDERMAN BENNETT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have been told at the present time in Winnipeg the maximum number of channels available is three. In other places, there is only one, and in some places, like Ottawa, none at all - there is no extra channel available. As people involved in civic administration here, supposing it was decided some time by the Government, or on our recommendation, or however it may be, that alternative grants of these licences were to be given; can you tell us how you select these?

ALDERMAN BENNETT: No, Mr. Chairman; I would not care to accept that responsibility; I do not know. It would have to be a matter of a guarantee, I imagine, on the part of the station - a presentation, possibly, to the CBC as to what they intended to do in that station - all those things would be factors, and on the basis of the present situation, supposing you had three or four different organizations applying, you would have to pick out those who offered the best.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that would be the way you would have to do it, but what is bothering me more is this, not so much selecting between three or four present applicants, but once you

occupy those channels and the grant of licenses has been made and you haven't any left, what happens to the people who are coming along later?

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: That is very simple: the poor people who come along later are in the same position, possibly, as I would be if I were to go to the CBC now and ask for an additional radio station in Winnipeg. The CBC would probably say, "I am very sorry indeed, gentlemen, but we now have four radio stations in Winnipeg and we feel, in our judgment, that four radio stations is what the proper number is for Winnipeg, and we regret we haven't any more."

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, in the one case you have a much greater physical limitation than the other. If the principle were for opening up radio and television station, you can go much further in radio than you can in television.

ALDERMAN CHISHOLM: Yes, but on what technical grounds do they feel they can only handle three channels in Winnipeg?

THE CHAIRMAN: There are only three channels available unless you move into the Ultra high frequency band, which is not available in Canada at the moment.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Chairman, that is three "additional" channels.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you very much; I have greatly enjoyed your representation, and we will give it consideration.

WINNIPEG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

APPEARANCES:

E. McCORMICK

W. FAULDER

R. BRENNING

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we are to hear is from the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and I understand Mr. McCormick will present that brief and will be assisted by Mr. Faulder and Mr. Brenning. You can begin by filing your brief as Exhibit 35, Mr. McCormick.

--EXHIBIT No. 35 - Brief of Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce.

THE CHAIRMAN: As you were here at the opening, we would be pleased to have you present this brief as you see fit and outlining it, if that suits you.

MR. McCORMICK: Mr. Faulder, who is Chairman of the Committee who prepared the brief, has suggested he would be bored if I were to read it at him again, and perhaps, seeing the Commission has read it, we should simply file it now, and I don't think there is anything we want to add particularly to it. This is, as it were, approved by our Council and I think we are prepared to elaborate within our terms of reference to our Council.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just so that those who are in the room and we ourselves can get it into our minds, would you cover the highlights.

MR. McCORMICK: First, Mr. Chairman, is that we have suggested what has been a hardy perennial with Chamber of Commerce separation of the regularary powers from the CBC and that they be in some sort of an independent body. We are well aware that the Aird Commission when it was brought down proposed all stations should be part of one National company, but the tendency has been to tolerate private stations in Canada rather than to regard them as people who have rights which should be adjudged by any separate commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want to interrupt you, but what evidence have you of that?

MR. McCORMICK: They have been taken as part of the National system.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is very different from "tolerance".

MR. McCORMICK: Perhaps I am too strong, but that was our feeling, that they had not been recognized as fully independent operating agencies.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

MR. McCORMICK: We considered that was tolerating them, sir, and it may be a term ---

THE CHAIRMAN: The private broadcasters in Ottawa told us they didn't want to be independent. We asked them specifically, "Do you or do you not want to be part of the National Broadcasting system?", and their President said an unequivocal "yes". So, this argument based on the notion that they are not completely independent operators just does not seem to fit the

wishes of the private people involved.

MR. McCORMICK: Well, that is their wish, but from our point of view we felt that they should be as independent and free to operate as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want to interrupt you because you are going to hit the highlights, but I want to get back to this regulatory board.

MR. McCORMICK: The second matter has to do with licensing, and that we believe there should be more TV licenses for private stations available in Winnipeg, and that, I think, is the broad statement of it.

The third is the matter of financing which was one of the questions raised and where we have suggested that possibly some types of programmes that are readily produced by commercial companies could be left out of the CBC's production schedule. I have in mind night-club programmes and things of that sort, all of which are produced by CBC, and that the CBC could perhaps save some money by confining its efforts to the cultural and educational programmes.

The fourth section is one on which our own people had some mixed opinions, but we think it is worthy of consideration, and that is that the CBC so far as any expansion is concerned in the field should be initially a producer of Canadian programmes, and perhaps some money could be saved by leaving the dissemination of these Canadian programmes, when produced, to private stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for outlining the

points. Are you carrying on, Mr. Coyne, with the questioning?

MR. COYNE: If you wish, Mr. Chairman, yes.

Mr. McCormick, turning to page 1 of your brief, under the first section, the question of regulation, you say, "We strongly urge you to recommend that a separate regulatory body having minimum essential regulatory powers be established over radio and television broadcasting in Canada." Would you care to say something about what you mean by "minimum essential regulatory powers"?

MR. McCORMICK: Well, obviously, the allocation of channels, sticking to those frequencies assigned, the programme content to some extent as to what is considered sound, the things that should be kept out. We have said that, because we don't go for regulation merely for the sake of regulation, and we feel that the emphasis should be on the keeping of regulation to a minimum and not ^{as} some of our people feel, regulation which has been put in to protect what is a monopoly. I am not saying that is what it is, but those are all absolutes of opinion. We favour keeping it to the minimum of regulation rather than expanding it.

MR. COYNE: That raises the question as to whether the existing level of regulation represents the minimum essential regulatory powers or if there are some regulatory powers or regulations at the moment, which, in your judgment, exceed this minimum,

and if there are, in your judgment, it would be very interesting for the Commission if you would point them out specifically.

MR. McCORMICK: I would think the opinion of the Committee was that there is possibility of extreme regulation but no indication of any having been applied.

MR. COYNE: So that as of this moment---

MR. McCORMICK: As of this moment I would say the Committee has no objection to the kind of regulation as it exists aside from some things we mentioned in the matter of issuing licences, and so on.

MR. COYNE: Oh yes, I understand. That is a matter of Government policy anyway, and it is not CBC policy or within the CBC's own control.

MR. McCORMICK: Quite.

MR. COYNE: Well then, if I understand you correctly, what you are really proposing is not any change in specific regulations that exist at the moment?

MR. McCORMICK: No.

MR. COYNE: But merely shifting of jurisdiction, if you like...

MR. McCORMICK: Yes.

MR. COYNE: ...from the CBC Board of Governors to some independent board. Could you elaborate a little on what difference you think a separate regulatory board is going to make in practical terms?

MR. McCORMICK: Well, I don't know what

difference it will make in practical terms, because it depends on the people who are appointed to administer. We deal, as the Chamber of Commerce, with the Transport Board and the Board of Transport Commissioners, with a private regulatory body. We appear before the Board of Transport Commissioners on the same side as the C.P.R. and sometimes on the other side, but there is no thought that the C.N.R., as a Government agency, is not subject to an independent body. They are two separate bodies. The set-up is a little different, I will accede.

MR. COYNE: Is it not substantially different because in the case of the railways or the airlines, if you like, the system contemplates several units competing together to provide a commercial service whereas, if I understand your discussion with the Chairman a moment ago, you indicated, as has been read to us, that the Canadian Broadcasting Act contemplates a single National broadcasting system in which the private stations play a part; is that really in any sense comparable to the situation you have in the transport systems of this country?

MR. McCORMICK: No, that is not but we would rather see it, probably we should have suggested that the Act be changed.

MR. COYNE: You told me a moment ago that you are satisfied with present regulations.

MR. McCORMICK: As regulations.

MR. COYNE: Is this not perhaps inconsistent with that statement in a sense that now you do want

some change about the structure of the National broadcasting system?

MR. McCORMICK: We would rather see the private stations free to operate under a private Act. I think what we suggest implies some change in the Broadcasting Act, we would rather see a parallel in broadcasting that approaches the transportation set-up.

MR. COYNE: How do you feel that this independent regulatory board would approach this matter in any different way from what the CBC Board of Governors approaches it now?

MR. McCORMICK: We are not sure that it would. We often are unhappy about the approach of the Board of Transport Commissioners but, at least, we feel in that case no-one can say they are tied to one railway or another.

THE CHAIRMAN: But there is only one ---

MR. McCORMICK: In this case?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, now ---

MR. McCORMICK: I think our feeling---

THE CHAIRMAN: You want two?

MR. McCORMICK: Yes, we want two.

MR. COYNE: One of the aspects of this that seems a little bothersome and we would certainly appreciate your assistance, the suggestion seems to be made that the CBC when it is involved in a matter of regulation, I think the statement has been made, that it is bound or is likely to look after its own

interest in its capacity as a regulatory Board. I think that is implicit, that complaint is implicit in your proposition here.

MR. McCORMICK: Well, I do not think we said just that.

MR. COYNE: Perhaps I am reading something into it that is not there but what I would like to ask you, if you can comment on it, the important thing about the Board in your judgment is that it will protect the public interest.

MR. McCORMICK: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Now, can you tell us ---?

MR. McCORMICK: It also protects the interest of the people who have to appear before it and are subject to it, I think it has to do more than just protect the public.

MR. COYNE: Well, the point of my question and it would be of assistance if you would care to comment on it, has the CBC any interest or, how can the CBC which is not a commercial corporation, not in the business of making a profit, how can it have any interest except the public interest?

MR. McCORMICK: The CBC can have an interest in building up a bigger organization.

MR. COYNE: You mean the personnel of the CBC are what are called ---

MR. McCORMICK: It is human nature, I am not saying it could be but---

MR. COYNE: And you feel this independent regulatory board would eliminate this?

MR. McCORMICK: It would have an impact there, I am not saying it would eliminate it.

MR. COYNE: But, nonetheless, this is a danger that you say may develop, you are not saying that as of this moment, it has been a practical problem?

MR. McCORMICK: No, we are suggesting that there should be two and that the Board should be there to provide equality of competition or opportunity.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would still have the CBC Board?

MR. McCORMICK: The CBC, yes, certainly.

THE CHAIRMAN: And in addition to that, you have this separate regulatory Board, you realize that is asking for more government expense.

MR. McCORMICK: Well, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understood Chambers of Commerce were very much opposed to increasing the government expenditure.

MR. McCORMICK: We are all opposed to unnecessary increase.

THE CHAIRMAN: My point is, do we not need to be very sure we are going to get the value for the extra money?

MR. McCORMICK: Well, it is an intangible thing, I think the question could be raised about a number of other boards as to whether we get value, but it is a safeguard.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think we need this?

MR. McCORMICK: We think there should be more

freedom to operate through the private stations and a safeguard, the regulatory board would provide a little more ---

THE CHAIRMAN: The private broadcasters tell me they do not want it, the private broadcasters are asking a separate regulatory board but they are also asking to remain in the National system and not to be separated completely into independent operators.

MR. McCORMICK: Well, is it necessary that they be all white or all black? Again we come back to our transportation, we have two main railway systems but it is possible to ship from a C.P.R. point to a C.N.R. destination by co-operation between them. It is not all one way and I do not think it would necessarily be here, the private stations could buy programmes from the CBC, the CBC could buy time from the private station.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, they could, but nobody has suggested they want to. Private stations today supply time in exchange for the CBC programmes, the CBC uses that time and the private station is a means of getting out a National programme through the private stations. From the private stations point of view they are getting a good deal of programming for their broadcasting but it is that kind of integrated operation on which the argument is and that the CBC is charged with providing these National programmes and they want to be able to make the necessary regulations of that sort for getting programming out as an operating

matter.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The Act actually calls upon the Corporation to carry on a National broadcasting system within Canada. Now, in order to carry out that National broadcasting system they have their own outlets and also make use of the private stations.

MR. McCORMICK: Some private stations.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but if they did not have some power of regulation over these private stations, how could they carry out a National broadcasting system? I am not a technician in these matters, I admit, and it may be necessary for them to have some stations in order to carry through the job that the Government has given them, as it is now, they carry it out by reason of the co-operation of the private stations which is a joint entity.

MR. McCORMICK: But here in Winnipeg there is the one alternative, a private station that carries CBC networks, there are three other private stations that are subject to the same regulations as that private station, even though they do not carry the programmes or very few CBC programmes. And while it may be necessary in the case of the one carrying the alternate programme, that is not necessary in the other three which are not part of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: What regulations are you talking about on these radio stations not carrying Government programmes, what regulations are you objecting to?

MR. McCORMICK: I am not objecting to any, but I say that you cannot ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: We will say they have stations in certain places where the CBC have no outlets, they would acquire those stations and that would be a greater cost to the public purse.

MR. McCORMICK: That could be by agreement between the two rather than by regulation of the central body.

THE CHAIRMAN: We were told it very largely is done that way that the two get together, they discuss it, they work out the procedures and if you put it into a regulation it is an operating combination.

MR. McCORMICK: Well, that is pretty much what I said, the regulations have lots of things but the practice has been that, but we are afraid of getting in law or in writing the things which are not necessary, that could be reached by agreement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we are clear on it, there is no objection to any existing regulation but you are afraid of the regulatory board?

MR. McCORMICK: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should think that particular objection could be made to a great many things in this country. Would you go back to another point, in your opening of where you say:

"In general, we favour the greatest degree of freedom compatible with the public interest."

What do you mean by that?

MR. McCORMICK: Well, this comes down to this question of licensing. There are, we understand, two or three groups that would like to open private stations here in Winnipeg and we would like to see them have a chance. It is their own money that would be lost if they did not make a go of it. The CBC has, I think, held television in the beginning back a couple of years because it would not licence private operators until it was ready to go into the field and it again took a few years because it concentrated on Montreal and Toronto when it began and yet there were people in other cities who were ready to open up TV stations without \$100,000. from the CBC, they were ready to take a chance.

THE CHAIRMAN: They all wanted the CBC programmes.

MR. McCORMICK: This is before the CBC started, there were people ready to operate TV but they were not permitted to.

MR. COYNE: Not by the CBC but by the Government.

MR. McCORMICK: Well, by the Government. Well, we say the regulations are made by the Government, we think it is wrong that these people should not be permitted to go ahead, the Government would not let them go ahead until the CBC was ready to go or until the Government was ready to let the CBC go. I want to make it explicit, these private operators wanted to go into private TV and others now are being

prevented from doing so and we feel they should be permitted to.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that particular one, your separate regulatory body would make no difference.

MR. McCORMICK: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: At the present time in connection with television you are saying that nobody should be both competitor and regulator, will you tell me in what way the CBC is competitor with the private television stations?

MR. McCORMICK: Not so far as television is concerned, this is in the matter of radio, not in television.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any more questions, Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: I was going to ask Mr. McCormick to turn to page 4 of his brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we will adjourn now for five or seven minutes.

--Intermission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Come to order again, please. Mr. McCormick, before Mr. Coyne goes on with another subject with you I would like to just go back again to the separate regulatory body and put a question to you which arises from that. You have told us pretty clearly that there are no existing regulations to which you are objecting, against which you are complaining, you also state that this power of regulation could be much tougher than it is at the present time; now, are you quite sure that a body such as the CBC doing these

regulations, pretty busy with a lot of other activities, very anxious I think to work with the private stations, that if you shifted this regulatory board to ~~an~~ independent board you probably would not actually in effect get a great deal more regulation than you are at the present time. In other words, is this a strange sight of the Chamber of Commerce asking for something which in fact is more regulation?

MR. McCORMICK: It could be, we would hope it would not be.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are asking for a body whose main function in life is to regulate, surely you have seen enough of the operations of regulatory boards with plenty of time to do the job with, what is the phrase, idle hands ---

MR. McCORMICK: Well, it could be, Mr. Chairman, but ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You think it is a matter of principle?

MR. McCORMICK: I think it is a matter of principle.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MR. COYNE: I was going to ask Mr. McCormick to turn to page 4 of his brief about two-thirds of the way down the page and you make a point here which is something new that we have not heard of before:

"Local manufacturers, distributors
and retailers, find it practically
impossible to purchase TV advertising

"at suitable times. We have heard from several people that they must purchase TV time at unsatisfactory hours on a regular basis in order to qualify for any better spots which may become available and which are not required by National advertisers."

Could you expand on that a bit?

MR. McCORMICK: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have in preparing this brief canvassed most of the advertising agencies in Winnipeg and we get the impression that certainly there is not forty-five percent of the time available on CBWT that may be a national average, I do not know, but ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Keddy, could you find out about that for us, please?

MR. KEDDY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will do that.

MR. McCORMICK: Secondly, we can give specific instances of people who wanted to advertise on TV, they were told they could have time 12.31 A.M. and if they took that on a consistent basis when times improved they could get on, the major time is pretty well filled up. We know National commitments of the television network is essentially National network and the choice times are devoted to National things, a man could get time at 12.31 A.M. but if he was selling a number of items it would be no good to him.

MR. COYNE: That is a situation which you say

faces the local advertiser?

MR. McCORMICK: The local advertiser, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Actually the total National programme comes to, I think, around forty hours a week.

MR. McCORMICK: Mr. Chairman, we did a summary on one evening's broadcasting and when we sat down and listened to programmes and that is given on page 5. At five o'clock is a National programme; 5.30 another half hour National programme; six o'clock another half hour National programme; 6.30 is a Sports parade; 6.40 Spotlight and at seven o'clock the News; those are all local programmes but they are definitely CBC and I do not think the CBC would entertain any sponsorship on that point. 7.15 was Crusade in Europe sponsored by a local firm; then a Round Table, for half an hour discussion then at eight o'clock a National programme; 8.30 a half hour National programme; nine o'clock a half hour National programme; 9.30 a half hour National programme and at ten o'clock another National programme. I think that is a reasonable typical day, there are variations of half an hour or an hour, but ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Does broadcasting or televising start at five o'clock?

MR. McCORMICK: It did at that time, I think it has been advanced a little in week-days, certainly if I get home at five o'clock it is on.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have Mr. Keddy here from the CBC and while he is not appearing on factual points, we would be glad to get any clarifications he could give.

MR. KEDDY: I have been informed that our

station in Winnipeg observes the same option time as the private station components of the system, that is, from 8 o'clock to 11 o'clock plus news, sometimes 11.15 which is reserved for National programming. There also is a period in the Children's period that is reserved before supper between 4.30 and 5.30 and outside of that it is run locally. There are restrictions which we impose on the CBC stations in that we do not sell our news, we have our own news.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nor do you have it sponsored in any way?

MR. KEDDY: No.

MR. McCORMICK: Could you tell us what that is restricted to?

MR. KEDDY: 4.30, a children's programme syndicated on a local basis, those are the times to be National, and they are done the same as private and CBC stations but on the CBC we do have more restrictive policies with respect to opinion and news and do not sell, that is, for advertisers. Then, there are local things which are produced and put into the schedule and there are also syndicated programmes which are put in locally.

MR. COYNE: Mr. McCormick, I think Alderman Bennett told us earlier that there are definite hours when the programmes are National network programmes that local spot advertisements and announcers are accepted by CBWT, is that your understanding too?

MR. McCORMICK: Not unless they are listed here, certainly I do not think any local commercial

spot would be played in in the middle of a National programme.

MR. COYNE: I was thinking of the beginnings and ends.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you anything about that, Mr. Keddy, during the evening hours are there any local spots?

MR. KEDDY: We had discussions with the principal stations and we agreed we would schedule a programme in a half hour where we said it would be sustaining, take an example, Press Conference, that would be 29 minutes so there is time before and after for local spot announcements which are sustained at the - from our own stations or the private stations but it is not within the framework of the programme.

MR. COYNE: Your point, Mr. McCormick, is the same point of your Council of the City of Winnipeg made earlier, that you do not feel that local advertisers have enough time available for local advertising.

MR. McCORMICK: Within their own market area.

MR. COYNE: Turning now to page 6 where you deal with the question of financing, I think I understand your point, based on programme classification, you are suggesting, are you not, that some types of programmes perhaps serve more the National purpose of CBC than others, and the others, being private entertainment or popular programmes might be reduced or dropped.

MR. McCORMICK: Might be left to private sponsors.

MR. COYNE: Just going towards the bottom of the page and following through this point you say:

"- encouraging the production of the more 'popular' type of programme by private Canadians, who have experience and are able to make a profit from such presentation."

Now, are there private Canadians who have experience in producing television programmes?

MR. McCORMICK: No, not in producing television programmes.

MR. COYNE: And if they have had no experience we do not know whether they are able to make a profit from such presentation?

MR. McCORMICK: No, but if they produce the right programmes of that type, they are willing and we are quite sure there are people willing to invest their money as sponsors of this type of programme.

MR. COYNE: I wonder what kind of programmes we are speaking of, the network programmes, those that the CBC consider to come up to network standards we are informed cost more than any sponsor, including the largest national manufacturers, are prepared to pay.

MR. McCORMICK: One of the examples that was discussed by the Committee, the specific case was a programme that originated in a local night-club which was the orchestra and singer in one of the local establishments and it was felt that a commercial sponsor could perhaps pick up the tab for it.

MR. COYNE: But is not that likely, that is

perhaps the only type of popular programme which on a straight commercial basis in the entertainment field would be a practicable proposition?

MR. McCORMICK: It may be, the others may be Western singers, that sort of thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would not get any original plays produced on this?

MR. McCORMICK: No, we admit that, we tried to make a split between what was purely entertainment and the other that you might call educational and cultural, much as you and I hate to use that word and we have no quarrel with the CBC producing, I personally have no quarrel with opera on TV, I like opera and symphony and I should, as an individual, be quite happy with the CBC spending money to bring it to me. I do not like wrestling so on Saturday evening my set goes off, but there are people who like it, but is it necessary to spend the taxpayers' money to bring wrestling?

MR. COYNE: The point I was intending to raise and on which, if you could express some views, it would be helpful to us, is that it probably is not just a question of saying, "well, let the CBC drop the popular programmes and the commercial stations will take it up", the effect, based purely on the economics of the situation would appear to be or might possibly be that if you drop the popular programmes from the CBC you are not going to have any popular programmes or, rather, they are going to be of a most costly type,

MR. McCORMICK: You are taking the CBC estimate on that, all I am giving you are the representations that

are made but we are sure nobody knows but certainly to the south of us where it is not subsidized, where there is no government agency, smaller stations to the south of us have put on lots of, it is corny and cheap, but there is some good stuff originating in smaller communities.

MR. COYNE: Carried by a network?

MR. McCORMICK: Not always.

MR. COYNE: But would you say this, would you consider that this suggestion you are making, which is a very interesting one, would be valid even to mean in practice that most of the type of popular programmes that CBC now pass on on the network would disappear from the Canadian television series?

MR. McCORMICK: I do not think so.

MR. COYNE: You do not think so and perhaps I do not think so but there have been serious financial studies made which tend to indicate that that might be a possibility.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that all the popular type of entertainment programme would be from the United States.

MR. McCORMICK: We do a pretty good job of that now.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, in strict economics, what you are proposing ---

MR. McCORMICK: Our people are not too concerned if there was a hard core of programmes which cover education and culture, what does it matter where the entertainment comes from?

MR. COYNE: Or what the level of entertainment is?

MR. McCORMICK: The CBC has regulations and standards.

MR. COYNE: Yes, but the CBC spends public funds in providing the entertainment at the moment and your suggestion is that those funds should not be made available.

MR. McCORMICK: No, but it would still control the type of entertainment on the other stations, they have those powers, they could still be charged with that responsibility.

MR. COYNE: I think if economics govern regulations having to do with programme content might not be of much effect.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, if you set your standards too high then the economics will ---

MR. McCORMICK: Well, I would say our standards at the present are not too high.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but our standards at the present time, we are told on the economic studies, do not carry the basic cost of producing this entertainment type of programme. In other words, some of this is provided from the public money, you say that public money should not be put in it, then the economics would be such that --

MR. McCORMICK: Well, there are two things that we think, if there were more TV sets, there would be more sets, there would be a bigger market, there would be more advertisers ready to use it, I think

these things would be ready to support it.

MR. COYNE: Are you just guessing?

MR. McCORMICK: I think future experience would show if it would or would not, I do not think they can show more than that they probably would, no-one can prove anything until it has happened.

MR. COYNE: Just dealing with the question of the development of the market selling more sets and that sort of thing, you refer to it on page 7, do you have any figures as to the point of saturation of the Winnipeg market at the moment? What proportion of the population within range of the Winnipeg station virtually own television sets at the moment?

MR. McCORMICK: We have had it but I do not think we have it here, but that still does not tell you whether the sets are turned on or off. My set is turned off with wrestling and other people with opera. There are people who have said, and there is no indication of how many, but they won't buy a set until something else is forthcoming.

MR. COYNE: The point you are making is that if there was another station there would be a larger sale of sets?

MR. McCORMICK: Yes, there would.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it from the answers you were giving that the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce is not greatly concerned with the production of programmes of an entertainment, popular kind by Canadians?

MR. McCORMICK: Well, we think Canadians will produce them, sir, but if they are not - I do not think

it matters whether you listen to a dance band recorded in Toronto or New York, I do not think that is of too great concern to Canadians.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to get your point.

MR. COYNE: Well, Mr. McCormick, turning now to page 8 at the bottom where you make this suggestion as to the possible reduction of the CBC operations, did your Chamber have in mind that the CBC should, for instance, close down or sell its existing TV or radio stations?

MR. McCORMICK: Well, that was one suggestion which was considered and which, on the basis of a referendum, our members were a little better than 50 percent in favour of it.

MR. COYNE: In favour of disposing of the stations?

MR. McCORMICK: Restricting some of them but we decided, because of the narrowness of the margin, the Chamber would not make any such recommendation. Now, I am going into the background to say we do not propose such a thing.

MR. COYNE: But really what you have in mind then, is, rather in your proposal is that the CBC should not extend its present facilities?

MR. McCORMICK: Yes, should not extend, we are thinking particularly in terms of TV of providing more coverage in other parts of Canada and perhaps money could be saved and we could get the same results by letting private individuals take the risk involved in building stations, the disseminating of programmes while

the CBC is a producer and by virtue of his regulatory powers insist that certain programmes be put on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, that has been the policy in the past few years.

MR. McCORMICK: Except that radio has been a system of regional monopoly, or TV rather, there could only be one TV station in any one region.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right, but you are speaking of building station facilities.

MR. McCORMICK: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you are proposing, as I understand it, that the CBC should not in spreading its system of the national TV service actually engage in the business of getting more disseminating outlets.

MR. McCORMICK: There was some question we decided not to include but I think it is worth reference, there are a good many feel that perhaps the CBC should leave the dissemination in the larger areas to private enterprise and if it is necessary to spread it the CBC should work in those fields where it cannot be supported.

MR. COYNE: I wanted to ask you as to what your Chamber would suggest along these lines with these areas, there are apparently many which simply could not support a private TV station.

MR. McCORMICK: Well, we did say that the suggestion was followed and the dissemination of the programmes was limited to those areas which cannot be adequately served.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In other words, you

are not prepared to see the burden of taxation increased on Canadians because it would increase the cost of the CBC.

MR. McCORMICK: If it is necessary so to do.

MR. COYNE: Just one last general question, has your Chamber any views or suggestions to make as to how the CBC should be financed at any level, that is, assuming that some level expenditure of public funds is justified, how should those funds be raised?

MR. McCORMICK: No, that question was not covered by the Committee.

MR. COYNE: That is, as to whether there should be a licence fee or a tax on sets.

MR. McCORMICK: No, but to begin with I would have to go back to policy to make sure there was not something about licence fees, and I am not familiar enough with it.

MR. COYNE: You are not in a position to make any suggestions to it.

MR. McCORMICK: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. McCormick.

MANITOBA FARMERS UNION

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presentation we have is from the Manitoba Farmers Union and I understand that Mr. J. Patterson and Mr. J.N. Galonsky are here to present the brief. We are very happy to see you gentlemen here and your brief will be filed as Exhibit 36.

EXHIBIT No. 36: Brief of Manitoba Farmers Union.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Patterson, how do you wish to proceed?

MR. PATTERSON: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, would it be permissible to read my brief, it is not too long.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will leave it to you, we would prefer it if you could go through it emphasizing the highlights, but if you wish to read it, then it is up to you.

MR. PATTERSON: Probably we can do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to get the essence of it.

MR. PATTERSON: In the first part we deal specifically with the background and the structure of our organization which sets out the reason that we are here. We are interested in the rural people and the rural areas and we are interested in getting a maximum of benefit from the CBC for these people who are part of our organization. Now, I think perhaps if we turn to page 3 and I will read through part of it. We are not delving into the pros and cons of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation because we are

confident other presentations to this Commission will bring out the required data in this regard from people who are better informed on the subject. However, we make the observation that radio and television are not what we would normally define a most essential industry, from the standpoint of the Canadian public, to the extent that it needs to be a state monopoly. Far from being opposed to any and all public ownership, we believe that under public ownership certain essential industries can best function in the interests of the people. It is questionable if the government at the time, or even if the public, realized that CBC would grow to be a colossus in which the people of Canada would be required to pay millions of dollars. From 1950 to 1955 we find it has cost the Canadian public in outright grants and through taxation, over \$71,000,000. In addition, there have been additional grants for television development. In 1956, the CBC budget is expected to reach \$50,000,000. This in our opinion is a huge cost to the Canadian public for the benefits being derived from this service.

We feel that the intended purpose of CBC was to give the people of Canada mass communication in the cultural and educational fields. It is questionable if to date CBC has achieved that purpose. We do not deny that much has been done in this direction but the major question is: have we got far enough, or have we gone in the right direction?

May we consider several specific phases which in our opinion are of the utmost importance to the future

of Canada:

We believe it is the duty of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as a public-owned organization, to serve the people as a whole in the educational and cultural fields, and through this medium to assess the thinking of urban and rural people. The CBC has occupied a unique position from which to carry on a wide programme of educational activities for the purpose of drawing together the various groups in our immense geographical area. Although a feeble attempt has been made in this direction, it is far from adequate. For instance, it is no effort to walk out on the street in Winnipeg and find that the first city dweller you stop does not know the first thing about agriculture or about rural life. The lack of understanding between urban and rural people in Canada is serious, and mass communication is the one means of overcoming this problem.

As you will realize, our interests are centred mainly around the agricultural aspects of the Canadian economy. Agriculture is the basic industry in this country, as a matter of fact, in any country, because without food no country can grow. We must have a healthy agricultural industry in order to enjoy a sound and prosperous economy. As agriculture is in the export business to a sizeable degree, we think that everything possible should be done to keep our products before the world at large. Also, we believe there should be continuous emphasis on the need for trade with those countries that consume our products, because trade must at all times be on a two

-way basis. A review of our trade balance discloses that our trade with the United Kingdom is not in a healthy condition, to the extent that we seemingly are making it very difficult for the United Kingdom to buy our agricultural products. Here, probably, is an instance where the CBC could render the Canadian economy a unique service by promoting programmes through which trade might be encouraged to the United Kingdom and other countries.

We are somewhat critical of the fact that our CBC network programmes are not only being used to advertise American products, but also that these same programmes, we understand, are being subsidized to a considerable extent by the Canadian people. This, we think, is not a healthy situation in view of the further fact that certain large companies are getting national coverage in Canada at reduced rates, while at the same time local advertisers must pay the standard rates of advertising through private stations.

The membership of the Manitoba Farmers Union is highly appreciative of the CBC's efforts in providing educational material, such as school broadcasts, programmes of special interest to farmers, Radio Farm Forum, Citizens Forum, and similar programmes. These make a substantial contribution towards achieving the intended purpose of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in our opinion. We would suggest that further consideration be given and a close scrutiny be made of the presentation of these programmes, in order that we may obtain the maximum benefit from the time

involved.

We would recommend careful deliberation on a wider coverage of events pertaining to agriculture, rural living, and natural life.

Periodically there has been marked criticism of the CBC for presenting too much in the way of educational programmes and weighty material, but we suggest that this material must be "dressed up" with suitable accompaniment (that is, music, sound effects, etc.) to attract a wider audience and to get the information across to those who need it most.

We hope that the CBC will continue to make their programmes available to private stations, as we believe that by this means the CBC can make a real contribution to the sparsely settled areas where it is difficult to maintain service. This type of assistance, or subsidization, will to some degree give the isolated rural areas the same opportunity as applies in larger centres. Another matter we would like to draw to the attention of the Commission - a matter which no doubt has been given serious consideration from time to time - but we would like to emphasise that there are some areas in outlying districts where the reception is not satisfactory, and at certain hours of the day it is very difficult to get a complete coverage of the Province from Manitoba operated stations. This is, we realize, a big problem, but we hope that some means will be found to remedy the situation.

We believe that the CBC, in order to perform the maximum service in the field for which it was

created, must be a neutral, unbiased body. Much criticism exists of the CBC's present policy with regard to the allocation of free time for political broadcasts. In this regard we think that Opposition Parties should receive equal consideration with the Government Party.

In order that the citizens of Manitoba may enjoy the same degree of service through television as they now enjoy through the medium of radio, we would recommend that an additional TV licence be granted in the Winnipeg area, and that consideration be given to expanding television services to rural areas of the province.

We would recommend particularly that, as soon as practical, these facilities be extended to the Dauphin area as we believe it is highly desirable that these areas be adequately serviced and that these people benefit to the fullest extent from the programmes now available.

We are primarily concerned with the tremendous outlay and expense involved in financing the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in general. We feel, on closer analysis, that through improvements in technique, administration and organization, sizable reductions could be made in these expenditures. This we think is most essential in view of the present economic position of the West - which is bound to have a decided effect on our general economy if the situation does not materially improve in the immediate future.

We hope you will find these recommendations

helpful, and they are respectfully submitted by the Manitoba Farmers Union.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add any comments or shall we go directly to the questions?

MR. PATTERSON: I think we could go to the questions.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Patterson, turning to page 3 of your brief where you are dealing with the cost of the CBC, at the bottom of the paragraph on that page you say:

"This, in our opinion, is a huge cost to the Canadian public for the benefits being derived from this service."

Do you mean there that in your view we are not getting our moneys worth, that the scale of the operations of the CBC should be cut down so that it will cost less money to the Canadian taxpayer?

MR. PATTERSON: No, I would not say so, I would say we could possibly with the expansion such as we suggest a little later on, that the service would be made available to more people. The cost is a factor in any operation, but the cost is justified on any project, you might say, to the extent that we get the maximum benefit from the costs involved.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not clear on this, gentlemen, page 3, you seem to be saying it is costing too much; on page 6 or 7 you are talking about wider coverage and further extension of the system which would mean it would cost more, now, which is it you are after?

MR. PATTERSON: We realize that for a service we have to be prepared to bear the cost but with the more widespread coverage more people are getting the benefit of it, therefore, the total cost involved is a secondary matter, that is, it is based on the benefits derived from that.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would like it to cost less but you do not quite see how it can if it is going to be extended?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, but, as we warned you when we started out in this brief, we are not experts on TV and broadcasting, we would much rather deal with some problems that we are dealing with every day. We do believe that we should have the maximum benefit from the expenditures, but at the present time there are various ways and means we think, according to reports, that that expenditure might be reduced some and possibly there are ways and means whereby these services could be made more remunerative as far as the CBC is concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it would be very helpful to us if you could admit that you are not experts in this field but you have made the statement it has been suggested to you that there are various ways and means whereby costs could be reduced, would you mind telling us what they are or is it just a general statement?

MR. PATTERSON: No, we do not like to make a statement without at least some thinking behind it. For instance, some of the programmes that are televised

for national coverage, there are times when it is necessary for the personnel to be assembled in Toronto or Montreal or wherever it is in order to make up these programmes and we feel that possibly, and here again getting down to technicalities, possibly a lot of that work might be done right here in Winnipeg, that that material could be collected here and perhaps in that way we could also have dual service, the benefit of the local talent and western talent in a much less expensive way.

MR. COYNE: Of course, Mr. Patterson, I think the CBC believes that in order to develop a local origination at points other than the larger centres, far from being less costly it would be more costly because money will have to be found to provide the programme production facilities in these other centres, therefore, it may well be that this desirable result that you look forward to of having more local programming will cost more money than the system that is now being followed.

MR. PATTERSON: I am not prepared to give you any data that would substantiate our thinking but for all practical purposes we are of the opinion that there are certain types of programmes that would not require elaborate and, perhaps, the equipment to the extent I expect you have in the east, but still could perform the function that is necessary in order to prepare that type of programme.

MR. COYNE: Could you tell us just a little bit more about the type of programme that you have in

mind?

MR. PATTERSON: Well, we might have several types of programmes, in the first place, we might have discussions, panel discussions that we have on TV occasionally, I would imagine that that could be done here in Winnipeg without taking the personnel to the east and also I would imagine that there are a considerable number of instances where we could make use of local talent, that it would be beyond the means of the individuals involved and the people involved because we find very often that talent does not emerge, is not always drawn from the places where there are finances available and these people too would have the opportunity of participating in such types of programmes and in that way would make a tremendous contribution to the listening audience that the people in the case would appreciate.

MR. COYNE: Has your organization any recommendation as to the manner in which the CBC should be financed at whatever level should be decided as an appropriate level of contribution to public funds, do you think that the persons who have the radio and television sets should pay for the services via the licence fee or something of that kind or do you feel there should be a charge against the general revenue which really means in effect that all taxpayers, whether they have TV or not, pay for this service?

MR. PATTERSON: At this time, are you suggesting that we split the two operations, that is, the CBC programming and TV, do you mean generally?

MR. COYNE: I was not suggesting anything, I would like to have any ideas you may have on the general subject.

THE CHAIRMAN: Put it this way, there is in your proposition in the existing situation, in any way you look at this thing, a public cost involved for the broadcasting of radio and television programmes. Mr. Coyne's question is, how does your organization feel that that public cost should be provided?

MR. PATTERSON: Well sir, I would say first that we did have a system of financing through licensing as far as radio was concerned for a considerable period of time, which was seemingly a very difficult thing to handle and expensive, and since that has been abolished, we have -- well, evidently there is no criticism of the present system. That is, they are content that it should be a charge on the Treasury and would eliminate the cost involved.

While at the moment perhaps there are certain who feel - this I don't think would be too general-- that because of the small coverage of TV, say, in Manitoba as an example, that the people of today should be prepared to pay more for that service instead of the whole Province subsidizing the effort. But, you will also find in a later part of our brief we are recommending this service be extended. So, we would not suggest any change at the moment, and with this system we have, should we anticipate that television will be available to the rest of the province.

THE CHAIRMAN: There has got to be some change because at the moment there is no provision for monies.

MR. COYNE: I take it you have no objection to the financing of CBC as a national service out of general tax funds?

MR. PATTERSON: That is, the basic needs?

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. PATTERSON: No.

MR. COYNE: You mention this recommendation towards the end of the brief, in extension into the rural areas, you mention the Dauphin area; do you have in mind they should be CBC owned or privately owned, or do you have any view on that aspect of it?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes sir, we have. I may point out here that actually we haven't, as far as our organization is concerned, delved too deeply into the pros and cons, and we are endeavouring to give the thinking of our people. As far as the outside area is concerned, we think that those are the places where CBC can perform the best function and they can give service, and any subsidization then would be to the people who are not in the position to provide the facilities themselves.

MR. COYNE: And at a cost to the taxpayer, of course?

MR. PATTERSON: There would be cost, yes, but it would be spread over as it is being spread over today, and that, to an extent, it would be equalized.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your organization is prepared

to see the television cost to the public rise if necessary to provide a service to outside areas not now serviced?

MR. PATTERSON: If the degree of service will justify that expense.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, how do you justify in this field where you are paying public money out?

MR. PATTERSON: We could possibly say that if the private people were to be allowed a little bit of leeway, possibly some of the cost could be reduced to the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know of any cases of that?

MR. PATTERSON: There was a point in the first submission presented this morning, "Do private stations want to have their own programmes?" . According to our information, they are not allowed. You cannot expect a single station ^{to} develop a programme, but if they were allowed to distribute their costs amongst private stations, right across the country, the cost would be so small that they may even produce better programmes than the CBC. Right now, they mostly cannot do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: This was not the evidence we got in Ottawa.

MR. PATTERSON: That is the way we feel about it here. What they feel in Ottawa is beside the point.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it is not beside the point at all. It is a question of what the facts are - not whether it happened in Ottawa or Winnipeg.

MR. PATTERSON: Surely, but there are three applications before the Government now for three stations in Winnipeg. You say there are only three channels; well, we don't expect to have more, because it would be ridiculous to have more than three stations in this city; but three people are willing to spend over \$3,000,000.

MR. COYNE: Could you tell us if you know whether any of those three applicants contemplate in their programme plans receiving any programmes from the CBC? One of the witnesses this morning suggested that they definitely contemplated receiving some programmes from the CBC - as far as one of them is concerned?

MR. PATTERSON: As far as I know, one application here in Winnipeg does not, but I think it would be in the interests of the general public that they do - some of the cultural and educational programmes.

MR. COYNE: Well then, I think you would agree that if they receive programmes from the CBC they do not operate at no cost to the taxpayer, because the provision of programmes by the CBC does involve cost to the taxpayer.

MR. PATTERSON: I don't believe the cost will be that high.

MR. COYNE: Have you any facts or figures?

MR. GALONSKY: A short film, or something like that, from the National Film Board or the CBC, I don't think the cost would be as high as going into

a big set-up costing millions of dollars; and even so, you can't produce the programme here, you have to go to Toronto.

About costs, we have the example where an M.P. was called up to go on a programme in Toronto, and he said, "yes, what time do you want me to appear?", and they said "oh, we will tell you", and they brought up hundreds of dollars of equipment to his hotel suite. That is waste and extravagance; there is no need for it. The man could have gone to the Broadcasting station. That is why we think the Canadian public should not be pouring millions into it. A railroad is a different thing, but this is a luxury line, and it is not a question of, "we cannot be without it".

MR. COYNE: Do I take it that in your judgment it is not worthwhile for the Canadian public to finance a national broadcasting system and that it should be abolished?

MR. GALONSKY: According to the Commission some years ago, I don't think that was the intention.

MR. COYNE: No, I am trying to interpret your statement of a moment ago where you said you didn't think it was worthwhile to have a luxury industry of this kind. Are you saying that you don't feel that it is worthwhile in Canada for a national broadcasting system to be supported by tax funds?

MR. GALONSKY: I wouldn't say that. It is no use me saying it, because it would be out of the question. It has gone too far. It has cost the public millions, and we cannot abolish it now.

How far are we going to go? I heard the statement the other day from two reliable sources that it is going to go up to \$100,000,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am trying to get into my mind what you are asking. On the one hand you seem to be protesting that some figure against the cost of what you describe as a luxury is not necessary, and on the other hand you seem to be urging that you want more money spent. I can't get my mind quite clear on it.

MR. GALONSKY: All right, take this approach: in the big luxury areas, in the country, where we are confident that private enterprise would pay its way, it is still costing us a burden for CBC. We have five radio stations here and everybody seems to be making money, and yet the TV is all alone and it has got the complete monopoly and it is losing money. Why should it?

MR. COYNE: One suggestion in Ottawa was that the production of TV programmes costs ten times as much, roughly, as to produce radio programmes.

MR. GALONSKY: Then there is an item.

MR. COYNE: You have to employ ten times as many people and pay the additional wages and you have the additional capital facilities, so it was suggested to us there was no comparison in terms of costs or economics between radio and television.

MR. GALONSKY: On page 6 you will notice we are mentioning the subsidies on certain big programmes. Why should the people subsidize Canada

Packers or Chrysler or the Ford Corporation? They are charging us plenty for the machines they sell. Why should we subsidize them?

THE CHAIRMAN: The answer to that would be that it is a question of whether you want the programme or don't want it.

MR. GALONSKY: Well, we certainly don't want Kate Aitkens to sell margarine in Manitoba. That is the biggest item against agriculture in this province, to allow Kate Aitkens to go on the national programme and work against a \$3,000,000 industry.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you are getting into specific programming.

MR. GALONSKY: But it brings out the point. We have to pay our own opposition as farmers to work against our own product. There is a specific example.

THE CHAIRMAN: This 26,000 membership in your organization, is that 26,000 families or 26,000 total members counting the different heads in the family?

MR. PATTERSON: We have the family membership, and the members of the family are members of the organization. That is as it states in the brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are five members in a family, those five would be counted in your 26,000?

MR. GALONSKY: It works out to about 14,000 units.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is one other question: on page 3 you say, "...radio and television are not

what we would normally define a most essential industry, from the standpoint of the Canadian public, to the extent that it needs to be a state monopoly." Do you suggest it is a state monopoly at the moment?

MR. GALONSKY: Well, what else could it be called?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, there are quite a number of people engaged in the private broadcasting business.

MR. GALONSKY: Yes, but they are controlled so severely. We have a programme on a private station here, and we are told by Ottawa what we can put on and how many hours we can put on, and we would like to get more time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let us not use the term "monopoly".

MR. PATTERSON: In broadcasting, as in any other such function, we have to have some control; we have to have direction, and a body to supervise what is on the air, but there are certainly times when we think that the regulations are not entirely justified.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is one thing we keep asking for and we are most anxious to get, and that is instances of regulations which have elements of unfairness or oppression in them. We asked this of the Association of Private Broadcasters in Ottawa and got very little indeed in the way of complaint. We asked Mr. McCormick this morning from the Chamber

of Commerce and he said he had no objection to existing regulations. If there are such objections, we would be grateful to have them.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, I would only cite one: as far as we are concerned at the moment, when we put on a sponsored programme we are allowed two minutes on that fifteen minute programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are what?

MR. PATTERSON: We are allowed two minutes on that fifteen minute programme. Actually, we buy a fifteen minute programme and we get fourteen minutes, and we have two minutes for our material on the programme. I think that is because of CBC regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it that would be a programme of an entertainment sort?

MR. GALONSKY: Commercial and entertainment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but it is not a talks programme or a debate programme that you are buying there is it?

MR. GALONSKY: We would like to put one on, but they would not let us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is another question, but this is a regulation as to the amount of advertising of the sponsor's personal time of the basically entertainment programme.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, I wouldn't say that it was a basically entertainment programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, what kind of programme is it? Is it music?

MR. PATTERSON: Getting down to technicalities, I wouldn't know to what extent we can go, but this particular programme, the one we are sponsoring is an entertainment programme, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the regulation is that on entertainment programmes, there should not be more than a certain amount of advertising material?

MR. PATTERSON: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Do you think that regulation should be rescinded and that there should be unlimited advertising permitted on the radio?

MR. PATTERSON: No, I would not say so. We have to be broadminded on this and I think here perhaps, where you might have the private broadcasters on occasion, they may be quite happy with that regulation that, if our material is too heavy, we won't get the programme out of balance. I think there is a point where the broadcaster would go along with that, but as far as we are concerned we would like to have five minutes out of that fifteen.

MR. COYNE: Would you like manufacturers who sponsor fifteen minute programmes to be permitted five minutes of advertising?

MR. PATTERSON: Well, if I got it, then anybody would be entitled to it too, that is right.

MR. COYNE: I have no more questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We are very glad to have these representations from a farm organization with a strong membership.

---The hearings adjourned at 12.25 P.M. until
2 o'clock.

MANITOBA FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE
AND COOPERATION

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand the next brief is a presentation of the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture and Cooperation and that Mr. Paul Terko, Vice-President is appearing along with Mr. J.T. McLean, the Executive Secretary.

MR. TERKO: That is correct, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Terko, we will file your brief as Exhibit No. 37.

EXHIBIT No. 37: Brief of Manitoba Federation of Agriculture and Cooperation.

MR. TERKO: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, if it is quite all right I will just read the summary of my brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not trying to hurry you at all, just take your own time with your presentation. We would like, at least, to see the summarization done and any further remarks you may like to make in connection with your brief.

MR. TERKO: Thank you, sir. Television is a tremendously effective new means of communication. It is just beginning to make its influence felt in our cultural, economic and political life. Its influence will probably surpass that of radio. It is challenging also the home, school and all other institutions and media in influencing today's young people. We expect it will play a big role in shaping the future of our community life. Because of this power and impact, very careful attention should be

given to public policy, in respect to both radio and television to safeguard the interest of all Canadians. With proper use, they will continue to serve our cultural and economic needs; be a strong unifying force in Canada and generally enrich our national life.

The M.F.A.C. has given consistent general support to the present structure and policies of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

The Manitoba Federation of Agriculture and Cooperation unanimously endorses the statement of policy regarding radio and television as adopted by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture at Hamilton, Ontario, in January, 1956.

Radio and television have yet to develop fully their potential roles in the field of reporting agricultural news; in carrying on agricultural extension programmes of concern and use to farm families and in interpreting agriculture's position to urban people.

We strongly recommend an increase in CBC facilities, staff and budget to permit an increase in public service programmes, including those for farm audiences.

In view of the value of television and its great potential benefit to Canadian society as a whole, and the gradual extension of television services to remote areas, we recommend strong public financial support to the financing of Canadian television.

The M.F.A.C. holds the view that since there is only one broadcasting system which has worked very well, there is no need for a separate regulatory board.

We suggest that serious consideration be given by your Commission to the question of whether one individual or private company should be permitted to control more than one type of mass communication media.

I might say in touching on economics that we are quite concerned about industrial combines and monopolies so we have inserted this phase so you may give it consideration.

Much has been said about television, whether it is entertainment or educational and we are more inclined to look at it as an educational body. It is quite hard to say now just where its entertainment ends and where its education begins. My young nephew is interested in watching wrestling and he can name certain holds which I cannot, therefore, that is education to him; to a student of ballet the movements mean something, and that is a form of education but to some, of course, it may be referred to as galloping gallops. But, that is another thing.

One of our affiliates has a national magazine which has wide coverage just now, it was a western magazine at one time but now is national and it sums up our feelings quite well. This has been printed since our brief has been prepared and I think it would be quite in order if I read it into the report:

"Educationally for persons of all ages its possibilities are immense, so immense in fact that it would be a tragedy of the first magnitude if television were to lose either its direct responsibility to Parliament or its effective control by the public broadcasting agency."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Terko. Mr. McLean, have you anything to add?

MR. McLEAN: No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne, I think you are taking this brief also.

MR. COYNE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Terko, I wonder if you could tell us how extensive TV reception is at the present time in rural Manitoba? Are there any figures or approximate figures as to the proportion of the rural population where people receive TV from the present facilities?

MR. TERKO: No sir, we have not the figures for that at all but it is quite limited, we are quite aware of that, and our interest primarily is to see that there is extended service beyond the present area.

MR. COYNE: There are stations now in Winnipeg and Brandon, I believe.

MR. TERKO: That is right.

MR. COYNE: And I think we have heard the figure of 60 miles as being the effective range of

these stations, is that, from your experience in rural areas, is that perhaps an approximate figure as to how far reception extends from say Winnipeg and Brandon?

MR. TERKO: I believe that would be quite correct. There is a lot of sets just coming in and they are increasing as time goes on.

MR. McLEAN: One point might be made, the fact that rural people are making extensive use of television when they are within range, and I would say there are instances where reception exceeds 60 miles. I am not a technician on this at all, I cannot say just what the range is but a large percentage of our people are now purchasing television sets and are now interested viewers.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, when you are within range there is a fairly good participation?

MR. McLEAN: A keen interest, very definitely.

MR. COYNE: I suppose you would not be in a position to make an estimate as to what proportion of rural people within these areas might now be receiving TV?

MR. McLEAN: I could not give you any accurate figures at all, I would say it was equal to the people in the rural areas who have TV sets and have not got TV sets, I take it as practically the same in the City of Winnipeg. I do not see any great difference.

MR. COYNE: Turning, if you would, Mr. Terko, to page 4 of your brief, you have been describing the

rural interest in radio and television and the representations which have been made by your organization in the past in general commendation of the CBC, at the bottom of the page, you say:

"For practical reasons, networks and the programmes they carry, must remain the responsibility of the CBC."

Then I notice, turning to page 11 where you are dealing with monopoly control, you also speak of the danger which would result if private radio stations were free to form networks without the approval of the CBC; I wonder if you could expand a little for us the objection you have to private networks existing, let us say, side by side with the CBC, not interfering with the national service but existing, a co-existence if you like, with the CBC.

MR. TERKO: Are you inferring a separate regulatory board?

MR. COYNE: No.

MR. McLEAN: You are talking about networks?

MR. COYNE: Do you feel there is any objection in principle to stations that are unaffiliated with the CBC forming some sort of network arrangement of their own, is there any objection to that type of thing and are you objecting to the development of private networks?

MR. TERKO: As separate from the present system set-up, that would be a different set-up than is now, is that the question? A set-up that would be

a different set-up than we have now, yes, then we are objecting to it because we think it has worked quite well in the field of radio with the CBC having control over these stations.

MR. COYNE: Having control, yes, let me put it this way, at the present time, so we have been advised, there are some, what you might call private network arrangements on a casual basis between various private stations arranged by the CBC at the request of the private operators.

MR. TERKO: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Do you see any objection to that type of arrangement?

MR. TERKO: Where they have arranged with the CBC for the programmes, no, we have no objection to that at all.

MR. COYNE: But you do see some objection in the development of private networks on an independent basis, is that correct?

MR. TERKO: Where it would be a competitor, a full competitor of CBC yes.

MR. COYNE: Could you explain a little or expand on what your objections are to the development of that kind?

MR. TERKO: We get into the field of regulations and control, we believe that democratically you have more say-so in the development of programmes through CBC on a private network, what control has a private citizen of what would be on a programme, what say would the private man have on the type of

programme. They could foster Canadianism, for instance, if it is profitable to do so, then it will be done but if it is not then it won't and you will have to go into a separate body over which you have no control, I believe if you have a separate regulatory body there are more in a field of censorship that you cannot have this and cannot have that but you cannot tell them that you must have programmes like that and these good programmes tend to develop the national Canadian life.

MR. COYNE: You feel, if I understand you correctly, you feel that in a system which is purely commercial, let us say, the ordinary citizen would be left to the whims of private commercial enterprise.

MR. TERKO: That is what I say, yes.

MR. COYNE: Am I correct in thinking that you do not feel any objection or the same sort of objection to being left to the whims of a state-owned broadcasting system?

MR. TERKO: Sir, we have an educational system that is State throughout and I do not feel that I would leave it to the whims of certain individuals or small groups, I feel I have a say in it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this what you are saying, Mr. Terko, that the democratic method of influencing what the State does gives you a protection which you feel you would not have in the purely commercial privately-owned system?

MR. TERKO: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Just turning to page 5, you are

continuing with the same subject matter and you say:

"The C.F.A. statement approves the development of private radio stations to substitute programmes of the national networks with programmes of local interest ---"

I notice you limit yourself there to radio stations, do you have any views on the development of private TV stations?

MR. TERKO: Yes, on the same basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: There should have been "private broadcasting" rather than private radio?

MR. TERKO: Yes.

MR. McLEAN: Within the limits where it is financially possible to do so, where the private TV station can do it, it is a more difficult task producing - for private stations, private TV programmes, as I understand it, but basically our attitude is we would like to see national television develop along the same lines as national radio has developed.

MR. COYNE: With perhaps private TV stations playing the same role in the television system as private radio stations now play in the radio system.

MR. TERKO: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Then, you go on, Mr. Terko, to a section of programmes of service to agriculture and you suggest on page 6 that there should be much greater emphasis placed on the efficient organization and operation of the farm, that there should be programmes designed of an educational nature dealing

with farm operations. Do you feel that those types of programmes of special interest to farmers should be developed as a public service out of the general funds of the National Broadcasting system or have you considered the possibility at all of farm organizations perhaps contributing to the development of programmes of that kind?

MR. TERKO: We have not gone that far to implicate the farmer to contribute. At present the suggestion here contained is that it be public supported.

MR. COYNE: What you are suggesting really is an extension perhaps along these particular lines of the sort of thing that the CBC has been developing in the radio field.

MR. TERKO: That is right. There may be instances, referring back to these broadcasts, there is a drama period in it, and in it will be contained information which is educational, probably it is a subtle way of getting that information, but it is a factor and it is surprising the number of listeners you have to the CBC farm broadcasts even in the city where they understand some of the problems.

MR. COYNE: Do you think farm broadcasts of this kind could lend themselves to commercial sponsorship as a method of assisting in defraying the costs or is it inappropriate in your view that there should be a sponsorship of programmes of this nature?

MR. TERKO: I have no objection to sponsorship, no, there would be no objection to it, provided, of

course, that you could see the continuity of the programme.

MR. McLEAN: There are three points as far as television is concerned in servicing these people, you have the reporting of agricultural news and events where farm organizations could participate and we have heard of programmes from Ottawa where the farm associations do assist in getting material and preparing the programmes. Then, there is this whole field of agricultural techniques, the problem of the farm today is getting the latest techniques and it would cut down the cost of them by using everything that is available in the Department of Agriculture, in the Universities, there is a tremendous field there where people have television. We doubt very much whether that sort of thing could be sponsored commercially, there would be a tendency to buy such an organization's product and we would just wonder whether it would be as objective as it might be. Then there is the field of interpreting the farm programme to the urban people, programmes of that kind I think could be certainly sponsored.

MR. COYNE: I notice going to the top of the next page dealing with much the same subject, you say:

"We suggest that the CBC give consideration to regular radio and television programmes dealing with farm business."

At the present time, does your organization

and other organizations interested in agricultural matters consult with the CBC as to programmes of particular interest in the rural areas or does the CBC consult with you or is there any sort of liaison between the CBC and the organizations?

MR. TERKO: I think to a certain extent there is a liaison between the CBC and the farm organizations.

MR. McLEAN: Well, in the farm forum we have assistance from the CBC from the Broadcasting Department but when you get into other fields where there is not quite as close a liaison, there are consultations, but I imagine if we had views on these matters they would certainly be listened to and considered.

MR. COYNE: What about private broadcasting stations in radio, do they do any broadcasting of this nature directed particularly to the rural areas and their needs?

MR. McLEAN: Well, as far as specific programmes like Farm Forum, not too much that I know of but any time we have been interested in certain projects or getting coverage from the private radio stations or any particular projects we certainly do have a great deal of co-operation, every assistance possible, as a matter of fact.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you thinking particularly of announcements and informative statements?

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think my next question was directed towards the kind of helpful programme you were listing in your three categories on economy.

MR. TERKO: Yes, not to the same extent.

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot think of any specific projects where they do it, there may be cases that we are not aware of but not to any extent that we are aware of.

MR. TERKO: As a farmer it is - there is a weekly programme on one private station that is helpful.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 8, as you appreciate, one of the main problems that the Commission is called upon to deal with is a matter of finance and how much public funds could be made available to a public agency and how they should be raised. You say here:

"We strongly recommend an increase in CBC facilities, staff and budget to permit an increase in public service programmes, including those for farm audiences ---"

Have you any specific ideas - obviously the increase in facilities and staff and budget is going to cost money, has your organization any recommendations or suggestions as to how the cost of a public broadcasting agency should be met?

MR. TERKO: This brief, of course, does pass on the problem of financing, there may be some difference of opinion in a lot of cases about finan-

cing, but there are two ways, one is when a person is a taxpayer and the other is from the consumer, and, as sure as anything, the money is going to come from the people anyway. I fail to see anybody's argument that you can have a station and it costs you nothing, it is going to cost you as a consumer if it does not cost you as a taxpayer. The licensing of radios, for instance, is probably - radios and television, the question of collecting a fee and the cost of policing it are quite major items and in the end the public has to pay for it anyway. Now, I think in a farm community, as taxpayers, we would be quite willing to see it come from the general fund providing that the facilities were extended into the farm community so it could benefit. This is with reference to television.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to explore this a little further because the problem is so far as public money goes into radio and television for Canada, which you are recommending and I suggest we have, at the present, I will agree with you that that has to be provided in some form by the public and you add to that, even if it is done on a commercial basis, the public also pays indirectly for the services they get. But, taking the public monies, there are two broad ways in which that can be provided; one is the one I picked out which you are supporting, out of ordinary tax revenues and the other would be one that we have had in the past for radio, namely, a method of the licence fee which,

those who support it, say it has the advantage that it is a direct charge against people who are getting the service. Now, I would think that if there was any group in Canada that would have an interest in having a licence fee system, it would be the farmers because I would say there are probably more people on farms who cannot have radio or television today, who therefore, get nothing from television today, and we are under the alternative system of paying from their taxes. You tell us there is no substantial opinion among the farm groups in favour of a return to the licence fee system, is that correct?

MR. TERKO: Yes, but I would say, bearing in mind that we are asking for an expansion of the facilities to include the farmers that are not within that range, then I think we can justify that it be out of public funds.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Of course, that is a long range programme or, at least, it could be on the part of the CBC to bring television to every Canadian but it may take, because of the cost, some considerable time to reach the end, would you still favour financing out of the consolidated revenue fund or would you prefer the other form of taxing those who get the service?

MR. TERKO: We might have a difference of opinion on the policy, as a long range policy, within a few years we would like to see the service extended which would not be unfair.

MR. McLEAN: I think the farm people are

very tax conscious already, they certainly do not want to be paying for some service that they are not going to receive but basically the approach of farm people and farm organizations have been one of including everybody and providing service in the most efficient and most effective way possible, but there is a limitation on their part to support or having to do with nuisance things like licence fees every year, they find it objectionable and they would far rather pay for it as a group providing the money is being used wisely. They feel it would be a more complete way of doing it and, as Mr. Terko said, the fact that eventually it was to be hoped that the great majority of the farm population will be within range of television services.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the fact is, as of today, you and your contacts with the farming community are not able to report any substantial body of opinion in favour of a return to the licence fee system?

MR. TERKO: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 10 and this is really a subject that I think you touched on earlier when you were referring to this question of a separate regulatory body, you say:

"We feel that if there were two systems, each deserving of impartial treatment, the result would inevitably be that no truly national public broadcasting system could survive."

Could you indicate to us in a little more detail why you think there could not be a national broadcasting system in parallel with some private arrangement financed by commercial revenues as a business proposition?

MR. TERKO: Well, I believe there is a limit to how much the economy of the country can stand and if you have two highly developed systems, it may be just impossible, you may have to curtail one, there might be quite an outcry for curtailing one which would be curtailing the CBC and in the long run I just cannot see how it would work.

MR. COYNE: That is, you are saying in effect that you think it wrong that if there was a comprehensive private system that it would be impossible to support a national broadcasting system as well out of public monies.

MR. TERKO: Well, of course, you have the other reasoning there too, but from the financial angle, is that what you are looking at?

MR. COYNE: I was just struck by your statement that no public broadcasting system could survive.

MR. McLEAN: Well, the thinking behind that is that basically today we have a combination of public and private monies going into one national system and if you did get into another system that you would have that private system probably draining off all the cream of the crop of the big advertising with popular appeal to certain programmes, a certain

type of service to the extent the cost would be too much for the public system to continue on, therefore, the tax-payers would not support it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Providing the public system continued the same type of programme and giving the same type of service they are giving at the moment.

MR. McLEAN: Yes, I doubt very much whether your public treasury would be able to stand it or be prepared to pay for it.

MR. COYNE: What you are suggesting is because a private system can go into the CBC system---

MR. McLEAN: Yes, and also the private system would not provide for him - if we provide a set of programmes that would be truly national or truly Canadian, they might give the hockey broadcast or the Gray Cup broadcast, but what about our national ballet and all the good music that comes over the CBC and all these other broadcasts that are of high quality and basically a lot of people want and require and is sort of a Canadianism.

MR. COYNE: But surely if there was a private system it might as you suggest cut into the commercial revenues which the CBC now derives, but surely there is no reason why it should cut into the public revenues which the CBC now has and which forms by large the greatest part of its budget.

MR. McLEAN: Yes, but the national treasury probably has to pay so much money into the present X system, that tax-payers of Canada would not want to

pay for it if we have to make up the commercial revenues that the CBC is using.

Our idea is it would cost a great deal more money from the National Treasury.

MR. COYNE: I think I understand your point, and going down further you say:

"Looked at nationally, in theory, there are no special fields or classes of programmes which can properly be placed in categories especially suited to public stations on the one hand, or private stations on the other --"

Now, we had a suggestion this morning from, I think it was the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce that it may be possible to distinguish, for instance, between their educational and informative programme which would have to be supported by public funds and the pure entertainment which the suggestion of the Chamber was, might be left to private hands and, first, what you feel would be that it would cost less public money to maintain these national broadcasting services? Your statement, I take it, in your opinion you do not believe that this distinction can be made between say, the informative and educational programme and the light entertainment programmes?

MR. TERKO: That is right.

MR. COYNE: You feel that the light entertainment programmes are as much a requirement of a public service as the educational programmes?

MR. TERKO: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Dealing with this question of monopolies which you raise in the latter part of your brief at the bottom of page 11 you say:

"We suggest that serious consideration be given by your Commission to the question of whether one individual or private company should be permitted to control more than one type of mass communication media."

Now, the way that is phrased it is merely a suggestion and not a recommendation, we did have here a recommendation the other day that some of the existing situation of co-ownership, if you like, should be broken up by law, that there should be a prohibition in the law against, for instance, ownership of a newspaper and a radio station in the same hands. I take it that you are not making any such specific recommendation?

MR. TERKO: No, that is just a suggestion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me take it one stage further, apart from breaking up existing situations does your organization feel that this should be an absolute prohibition against the granting of licenses, let us say, a specific license for a radio station to a newspaper publisher, or do you think this is only one of the factors that should be taken into account in assessing who is best suited to get a license? How far do you drive it, is it a prohibition or merely a matter that the licensing authority should take into account?

MR. TERKO: I think that the licensing authority should take it into account.

MR. McLEAN: We do not go so far as to say it should be written into any Act but it is a factor and it should be taken into consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is, this could happen if there was a license open in radio or television that the only effective person prepared to take it up was the existing publisher of the newspaper and then your choice is between having him do it or have none at all. Those are issues I want to make clear as to whether you were thinking of a national prohibition and you tell me you were not.

MR. COYNE: Those are all the questions that I was going to ask Mr. Terko, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TERKO: May I raise just one more thing, it is an oversight and I am sorry I missed it out, it is just an expression that we would like to see a good agricultural representative on the C.B.C. Board of Governors.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you saying in effect there that you would like to see a man on the C.B.C. Board of Governors with knowledge of agricultural conditions or are you wanting a specific representation of an agricultural organization or group of organizations?

MR. TERKO: Not necessarily specific representation through an organization but good knowledge of farming, if possible.

MR. McLEAN: We feel the Board of Governors

do an excellent job. In the past there has been an agricultural representative but not in recent years and someone who has been associated with the industry we feel could contribute both to the management and types of programme and everything else that comes within the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for coming.

MR. TERKO: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

SUBMISSION OF GENERAL FACULTY COUNCIL
OF UNITED COLLEGE, WINNIPEG

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief, I understand, is to be presented by the General Faculty Council of United College, Winnipeg and the appearances are Dr. W.C. Lockhart; Prof. J.H.S. Reid; Prof. K.W. McNaught. We will begin by filing your brief as Exhibit No. 38.

EXHIBIT NO. 38: Brief of the General Faculty Council of United College, Winnipeg.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may proceed to present it as seems best to you, either by reading it or summarizing it.

MR. REID: I think I should make an initial statement, I do not think it is necessary to read it

all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, would you try to make the statement as loud as you can so those in the back of the room can hear?

MR. REID: Yes. This is a submission simply presented by the Faculty Council of the United College in this City, and may I say one thing about our general approach to this problem, we do not claim to be anything more than simply reasonable, well-informed listeners and viewers, but since one assumes that many Canadians are in that category we felt it was valid for us to present our opinion. We make no apology for the fact that we do not touch on a great many important questions which I am sure this Royal Commission will have already dealt with. However, we think our brief presents a point of view which does deserve some consideration for two reasons; one, as teachers we are vitally interested in both education and in national culture as well, and those are two very significant aspects of the work of any television and radio broadcasting system, whether it be national or not. We are vitally interested. Secondly, as teachers we have no particular financial interest in either commercial rates or a national system, and our opinion should be as reasonably close to the 'no prejudiced' viewer as it is possible to get. With simply that in mind we set ourselves the job which we have suggested in our brief, the job, first of all, of attempting to lay down three general questions, and we put them in our brief:

- "1. What are the general purposes for which the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was originally established and is now maintained?
2. Are these purposes valid, and are they sufficient to warrant the continued existence of the Corporation?
3. How effectively does the C.B.C., as at present constituted, serve the purposes for which it was established?"

The answers which we finally arrived at we have incorporated in our brief where I might perhaps amplify. At the top of page 2 we have commented on the fact that there is historical evidence for state subsidies through publicly-owned enterprises of dramatic and musical and other cultural activities. Since two of the three of us are historians we will be prepared to support that historical evidence.

On the same page we have expressed an opinion about the present language policy that is now followed; we feel very keenly that an approach should be made to the practice of having some French programmes in French on the English-speaking networks. How far that should go is a matter of some argument. We have suggested one or two suggestions on programming, one on page 2 in which again you may see our historical interests have reflected.

THE CHAIRMAN: Prof. Reid, I think some of the points you are making in this brief are extremely interesting and are new to us, and I would

not want you to slow down, so take whatever time you need to explain them, because their value is then repeated because it is fully stated publicly.

MR. REIF: Very well, then, sir. We have made one or two programme suggestions, the first one is this matter of the language policy that the C.B.C. follows at the present time. It is quite clear, for instance, that the policy is as nearly as possible to having a French-speaking network and an English-speaking network and, in fact, we have heard that one of the difficulties in Montreal, for instance, is the fact that the facilities are not there in duplicate, used to provide facilities for both. We feel rather than separating a French network, the French programmes from an English network, that some sort of liaison between the two and transshipment of programmes would be of some national value. The second specific proposal we make about the programmes at the bottom of page 2, we feel that one of the materials out of which this Canadian National identity about which we have heard so much today, one of the materials is Canadian history. At the present time, not only is this field of Canadian history not being adequately worked by radio or television, we feel it is misrepresented in the eyes of the Canadian public and, most unfortunately, in the eyes of the Canadian school children. One suggestion that arose from our discussions was a specific suggestion that both film and television might make a good deal more out of the events of our history and out of geography than is

now being made. We suggest a National Film Board and C.B.C. co-operative enterprise might be on film and through the work of a cameraman might be on film, for instance, the story of any one of the important Canadian journeys in Canadian history. We have suggested some, for example, to go with Father Albanel to the mouth of the Saguenay over the headwaters and overland to Hudson's Bay, and this country is almost exactly the same today as it was when Albanel went out on it. We felt that with some imagination it could be put on film. They could take a trip with MacKenzie through Lake Athabaska, that is a tremendous journey, across the mountains and down to the Fraser River and overland to the Pacific. This would do away with the idea that Canadian history is dull stuff and with such stories we would like to see a good deal more made of them. We have one or two other suggestions, not on programming, but rather on the function of the C.B.C. It has been generally accepted, I think, and we suggested in our brief that this was one of the purposes for which the C.B.C. was formed, to help develop Canadian talent. We are suggesting two things, one is a system of scholarships and of subsidies of one kind or another that would operate somewhat along the lines that are now being proposed for the Canadian Council. In other words, scholarship funds could be used to free Canadian artists or Canadian technicians for experimenting, for study and possibly for achieving new effects both in radio and television. We had a

second proposal, and that was that, bluntly, the C.B.C. might do a good deal more than it does now in the matter of using Canadian artists of one kind or another. Another specific proposal that was made was this, that in considering its building programmes, the C.B.C. in the past has neglected, we thought, one line of action that should be very valuable and one it might follow in the future, when a new plant is being established as, for instance, is being done here in Winnipeg it is quite conceivable that plant might incorporate a theatre in which some of this work might be carried on. In other words, the theatre itself might be the core of a broadcasting plant. Such an enterprise here in the City of Winnipeg would meet a need which many of us feel has long existed.

Our general conclusions are these, we feel that there are three courses of action in dealing with the present situation; one is that the C.B.C. could be disbanded and the whole field left for private enterprise in exactly the same as theatres and sports activities are left now. We do not believe that that course of action is either practical nor possible. Secondly, the present system of mixed government and private enterprise might be retained and, where necessary, improved. If that is the course of action that is to be followed we have made five specific suggestions; we would like to see the C.B.C. give more attention to the recognition and portraying of regional influences in its programming policy. That, I think, has been said from many points of

view already to this Commission and probably will be said many times again. Specifically we recommend that the French network cease to be so exclusively French and the English network so exclusively English. Our second recommendation, always assuming that we will continue to keep our present mixed system, is that the C.B.C. should give more time to non-commercial programmes from other countries and most particularly from countries that are fellow members of the Commonwealth of Nations. We feel they are not making use of facilities that are available for the bringing in of programmes from other Commonwealth states, nor is it making use of such agencies as UNESCO and the Information Service of the United Nations. In other words, the national system in the world of today must be not only national, but must look beyond its national boundaries. Particularly do we feel that the area of Commonwealth relations is an area that is being rather badly neglected at the present time. We are of the opinion that the Commonwealth of Nations is one of the half-dozen international organizations that gives any annual support to study and we would like to see it both support and study. Our third recommendation is that the C.B.C. in its regulatory role should examine very carefully the present quality of broadcasts over all Canadian stations. Specifically we wish that the Corporation would enforce its own rules to begin with upon its own stations. We are referring to the rules which place limits on the amount of advertising time, for instance, that

can be provided by any station. We would like to see a rule and a rule that would be followed. This morning I took a stop-watch and timed the advertising content of the programmes on one Winnipeg station from 8.00 o'clock to 9.00 o'clock, and in the sixty-minute period twenty-two minutes and forty-two seconds were devoted to advertising, some of it consisted of singing commercials which might or might not be called advertising. We recommend, fourthly, that the C.B.C. or the proposed Canada Council or some similar agency, should be empowered to launch a scheme of scholarships and prizes to encourage the participation of Canadian artists, producers and technicians in the experimentation with and the development of our broadcasting and television facilities. The fifth recommendation is one that is hardly a recommendation, it is more an observation. We should recognize officially that radio broadcasting and television have acquired three fairly distinct functions: they are at one and the same time agencies to educate and influence, agencies to entertain and agencies to sell goods. In the public interest first consideration should be given to the educative function of broadcasting and last consideration to its use as an advertising medium. Increasingly, it seems to us, the tendency has been to follow the reverse order. In Canada at least this tendency must be stopped. If only state regulation can do it then we must have state regulation. These five recommendations are the recommendations which we would like to see implemen-

ted if a mixed system of private enterprise plus state activity is to be maintained. However, there is a third possible course of action. All of the above recommendations, and indeed all the purposes for which the C.B.C. was originally established, could best be served by a completely publicly-owned broadcasting service like that which Britain until last year maintained to the exclusion of all others. The success of that system can hardly be questioned. The Aird Report in 1929 accepted the principle that all broadcasting organizations in Canada "must be operated on a basis of public service." The special Parliamentary Committee on Radio in 1936 unanimously agreed "to reaffirm the principle of complete nationalization of radio broadcasting" and only "pending the accomplishment of this nationalization radio listeners will continue to be dependent on private stations for much of their entertainment." Most of us in this Faculty believe that the new problems raised by the appearance of television have only strengthened the validity of this conclusion.

As a result of this we recommend that, instead of reorganizing our present mixed system of radio broadcasting and television in the direction of more opportunities for commercial operations, the Government of Canada should give every consideration to the possibility of implementing now the often approved principle of complete nationalization. In so doing the principle that it is wise to separate regulatory and production functions should

be accepted. We also suggest that the administration of the publicly-owned Canadian Broadcasting System should be placed in the hands of several regional boards rather than in those of a single centralized board. It may be that the other two members of our committee will have some observations to make.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lockhart?

MR. LOCKHART: I do not think so, I will just wait for the procedure to go on.

MR. McNAUGHT: I would agree, perhaps we would go faster with questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will hear some questions in a moment, but I want to say that we appreciate your coming here and giving the thought that you have to this brief, not only for the purpose of what your ideas were, but for the very clear and sound way in which you have set your points out in your brief. We now move to questions, and as I have stated many times, questions are not indicative of any views the Commission has but are only asked for the idea of getting the exact idea before us. Mr. deGrandpre, I believe you are going to ask questions on this brief?

MR. deGRANPRE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Prof. Reid, I see that you have gathered the impression that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has, to put it in your own words, "... we are agreed that the 'national' goal has been perhaps too narrowly defined." Do you relate this remark, which appears at the bottom of page 1 of your brief, to

the improvements you have suggested on page 2 such as the incorporation of the French portions on the English network and the development of Canadian history through the co-operation of the National Film Board and the C.B.C.?

PROF. REID: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: That is closely connected, I understand?

PROF. REID: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: This particular reference that you make to the incorporation of French-speaking programmes on the Canadian network is one of the very difficult tasks which C.B.C. will be confronted with undoubtedly if they decide to accept this suggestion of yours: Do you have any complete plan that you have elaborated, or is it simply a thought that you are giving out for reflection?

PROF. REID: It is a thought we are giving out for reflection. Rather than having any complete plan of integration, we are disturbed by the absence of any plan. We quite understand that it will be an extremely difficult job to build these bridges between the two different sets. What we would like to see is the attempts to build the bridges, and we are disturbed by the fact that there are very few attempts to build those bridges now.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Would you start, as I very would say at the first rung of the ladder and build it up gradually? What I had in mind is this: For some people there is a language barrier, and

would you have in mind that French or English lessons would be given, to start with, so that the listener of the other language would just get more familiar with the other language?

PROF. REID: Well, actually, there are two jobs. One job -- and this is apparently what you are asking about now -- is the job of trying to bring to our English-speaking audience some facility in French. But even if that were not attempted, there is still another job, and that is to make it possible for members of the English-speaking audience to see some of the productions that are available to French-speaking audiences at the present time. Perhaps I am on delicate ground, I don't know, but many people feel that the level of excellence of the French network is higher than that of the English network, and I for one would like to see some of the very excellent programmes that are available on the French network made available to the English network, whether the language is involved or not.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I see your point, but for somebody who has a nominal knowledge of the other language, that is possible, but if there is a very big language barrier between the two do you think that you could reach a sufficient number of the population, or a certain percentage of the population speaking the other language so that the programme would really carry some appeal?

PROF. REID: We are university people, and in the City of Winnipeg from our university

population roughly 200 to 250 students leave university every year supposedly with a knowledge of French that they have acquired as a foreign language. All we would suggest is that they may be given an opportunity to use and improve that at some time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you put the point in a slightly different way? If tomorrow you started carrying good French programmes on the English national network, do you think that the people of Canada who listen to the English national network would accept them and hold their sets in operation, or would they switch them off?

PROF. REID: I think one section of the population would welcome it. It may not be very numerous, but it may be worthwhile.

PROF. McNAUGHT: I think that is one of the points the Faculty as a whole were interested in making, that in this particular area you have a minority group which is being discriminated against in a sense. I think we can easily under-estimate the number of people in English-speaking Canada who have had contact with the French language in one form or another -- usually in high school -- and who would welcome a chance to brush up on it and keep in contact and improve their French, as well as the arguments that the cultural level of the French programmes is often superior, and certainly represents the major facet of our culture.

THE CHAIRMAN: Whether it was superior or not, your point would also be that you believe

the interchange of the different cultural programmes is desirable?

PROF. McNAUGHT: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Would you go so far as to say that even if there is a very limited percentage of the viewers who would remain tuned in during a French-speaking programme on the English network that it would be even worth the effort to continue, and continue so that you would gradually increase this percentage?

PROF. REID: I do.

PROF. McNAUGHT: It seems to me there is, of course, more than one English-speaking network on radio, and one of the points at which we aim in our last conclusion is that there would be more than one television network envisaged eventually, so it would ~~never be~~, at least within the not-too-distant future, it would not be a question of simply listening or not listening to a French programme.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You are assuming a choice between two television programmes?

PROF. REID: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Throughout Canada?

PROF. REID: Throughout the major population centres.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Whether publicly-owned or a private system alongside of the public system, perhaps fed by the C.B.C., but parallel to the other which would give the public a chance to choose between the two?

PROF. McNAUGHT: Yes.

PROF. REID: I am not sure I would accept it quite like that. I think there are two kinds of choices that may be offered to the viewing public. One would be the choice offered by a national system organized on several levels which may offer three, or two possibly, programmes at any one time, and that is a different kind of choice from the choice you have just suggested, the choice of a programme offered by a commercial system and the Canadian National System.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Yes.

PROF. REID: I would approve the first kind of choice.

THE CHAIRMAN: What you are really saying about the use of the French language on English networks is that the C.B.C. is under-estimating the desire of people to have this kind of fare on their programmes?

PROF. REID: I think it consistently under-estimates it.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: As far as the choice on the radio as distinct from television is concerned, and the fact there are a few stations in this part of the country -- there is one here?

PROF. REID: There is a French-speaking station, yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: And it is fed in part by the C.B.C.?

PROF. REID: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: So there is a

choice in this part of Manitoba?

PROF. REID: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: That is not true for the rest of Manitoba?

PROF. REID: That is true.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: It is a small powered station?

PROF. REID: Yes. I am not a radio expert, but I think there may be a difference between French language programmes obviously designed for French-speaking people, and French programmes designed for English-speaking people, and it is the second kind we are asking for.

MR. deGRANDPRE: They should be tailormade for the audience they want to reach?

PROF. REID: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: There is another very interesting suggestion about incorporating more material, referring to Canadian history in the C.B.C. programmes, and I see that, just as examples, you have given the case of explorers and fur traders?

PROF. REID: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I am wondering if this was field which should be tackled first by the National Film Board and then in turn transmitted through the C.B.C., because it is a project of magnitude that you are contemplating in this particular paragraph. Don't you agree that this would be more for the National Film Board to first produce the films and then for the C.B.C. to show them?

PROF. REID: I would think that probably as a co-operative venture it may be handled very well. The National Film Board does have the technicians, and, frankly, we were not suggesting the sort of thing that is now being done in the United States where scenes from American history form a fairly important part of the television scene, for example. There are corporations with professional actors who will re-create scenes of American history and you get all the action. We were not thinking of that sort of thing as much as of a more easily available thing, the photographing of the country itself. It is more in the nature of documentary filming and, as you say, the National Film Board is equipped for that.

MR. deGRANDPRE: So you would suggest that the National Film Board should take the outside scenes and then that there should be a parallel made in the studio, and then there would be no recording of the discussions between the members of the cast on the film itself, but it would be run in parallel in the studio with members of the cast giving explanations of the scenery that is shown on the film of the National Film Board?

PROF. REID: Possibly. As an historian I can see that photographing of the rocks and bush and rivers are straightforward, and, after all, the rocks and bush and rivers will not misrepresent and cannot be made to misrepresent. The other thing you are suggesting, the use of a cast to reproduce

the events, would call for a great deal more. I am not suggesting that could not be attempted, but we suggest the other should be attempted first.

PROF. McNAUGHT: We also agree that co-operation between the Film Board and the C.B.C. is very desirable. For any major project of that kind the revenues of the C.B.C. may not be adequate, and it should be fully co-operative.

THE CHAIRMAN: As historians are you at all concerned -- you mentioned the development in the American radio and television system of scenes from American history, and quite a number of these programmes are able to reach many parts of Canada -- and do you as historians have any concern about the necessity of Canada getting that kind of thing because of the danger that our children will have too many American scenes in their minds?

PROF. REID: I saw the portrayal of the Boston tea party and I would hate to see any Canadian system attempt to match that.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I didn't mean from the point of view of duplication.

PROF. REID: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: But, if you have historical scenes being told from an American point of view, which is perfectly legitimate from their point of view, does that fact make it necessary for us to tell our story in a Canadian way as well?

PROF. REID: It makes it advisable, I think. The thing that sells these scenes from

American history is that they are interesting to the adolescent audience. I maintain the material ~~ing~~ from Canadian history could be just as interesting.

MR. deGRANDPRE: There is some suggestion in the second paragraph on page 3 that the C.B.C. has the right to regulate and "we only wish it would begin to exercise that right." There has been some suggestion while we were sitting in Ottawa that the position of the Board of ~~of~~ Governors of the C.B.C. is rather difficult in the sense that the public relations department of the C.B.C. also looks after the regulatory functions -- the Stations Relations department looks after the regulatory functions of the C.B.C. Do you think that per se this is an anomaly and it could be changed, or is it simply that the same form of regulatory function could be performed by this same body, or do you suggest any changes in the final set-up?

PROF. REID: I am speaking for myself only: I agree that in principle it seems wrong that one agency should at one and the same time compete with similar bodies and also act as a referee in its own case. However, I think if it were made completely clear that these two functions, one of producing a national -- a body of material for a national audience, that plays the function of regulating everything it has produced, whether by the C.B.C. or not, that if these two functions are to be maintained, then the question as to whether they will be maintained by one body or two is an ~~ad hoc~~ ^{ad hoc} decision.

administrative question. I, myself, feel that for purposes of administrative ease and for purposes of meeting this objection in principle that is often made, it would be wise to separate the two functions.

MR. deGRANDPRE: But when you suggest another body be created, whatever it is named, how can it be made practical if you realize the public system works in conjunction with the privately-owned stations? In other words, the C.B.C. uses the facilities of the private stations in order to serve some sections of the country.

PROF. REID: That may be simply another reason for the final recommendation that we made, that there should be only one organization.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Let us take this one right away then. You are suggesting that there should be a complete coverage by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation?

PROF. REID: Or something similar.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Something similar to that, and that therefore the C.B.C. facilities should be extended in areas now served by private enterprise: Is this substantially what you have in mind?

PROF. REID: Yes. Are there many areas now served by private stations that are not now served by the National station?

THE CHAIRMAN: In the television field there are quite a number, yes.

PROF. REID: Oh, yes, in television.

MR. deGRANDPRE: In the radio field there

are some areas also, I understand, that are served by private enterprise, and it is through the channel of private stations that C.B.C. reaches those areas. You have to concentrate on a project of this nature on the cost that it would involve; I have no idea of the magnitude of the cost if C.B.C. were run a publicly-owned system throughout the country covering all the areas of Canada, but if that is so, what would be your thoughts about financing this project? Would you think in terms of license fees, or would you think in terms of supporting this cost by public funds?

PROF. REID: Well, I would say three things: One, that the C.B.C. as at present organized apparently assumes that sooner or later it will reach to every section of Canada. That is one of its purposes that has been accepted, isn't it?

THE CHAIRMAN: On that I think, Mr. Reid, there are different ways in which the reaching can be done. One would be by way of a publicly-owned and operated system, which is your final preference. The other is the extension of the present system, which is to use private stations as a means of reaching out across the whole of Canada.

PROF. REID: And the question is, how will the expense of assuming ^{all} these facilities and placing them in the hands of the C.B.C., how will it be met?

THE CHAIRMAN: If you tried to put it on a completely nationally-owned and operated system

it would be obviously very much more expensive than today. If you do it by using private stations it may be not as much, but still more expensive, and Mr. deGrandpre is asking whether you have given thought of how to pay that expensive operation, either by way of license fees or by payments out of the public treasury?

PROF. REID: I suppose by license fees and a system of licensing, or secondly, for the available funds to come directly out of public revenue -- out of the consolidated revenues or from excise duties on the manufacture of sets. I would suggest maybe that a combination of all three would be the answer. After all, it is perfectly true that there are some areas in Canada in which individual Canadians are not able to have television sets. Why should they then be asked to pay the costs of the television service? That is a question that will be asked. The provision of a national system will provide benefits for other citizens in Canada, and so that every citizen in Canada should be asked to bear part of the expense; perhaps not in toto; perhaps there may be an apportionment of the cost between all three of those areas of revenue.

PROF. McNAUGHT: We did not give very precise consideration to the financial problem in our discussions because we have been more concerned with the general policy, and we didn't have a lot of the precise financial information, but I think we were interested unless you asked what the cost

would be. Well, obviously it is not quite that simple. It is a question of how much it would cost for C.B.C. to buy out existing stations. Against that you would have to add a good deal of advertising revenue that would come to the C.B.C. instead of the private stations after they were taken over. Also you would not be subsidizing private stations but a completely publicly-owned system. We found it would be too difficult for us to estimate in any precise way what the cost of expropriation would be.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I see if I am clear on one point: What you were saying a moment ago, Mr. Reid, was that there is an interest for me as a citizen of Canada in getting national programmes out to the Peace River whether I own a set or not?

PROF. REID: Very definitely.

DR. LOCKHART: In other words, we feel it is a national concern that our people should be sure the facilities are available to all our people, and therefore should be prepared to bear the cost.

MR. deGRANDPRE: No matter what the cost will be?

DR. LOCKHART: As the general public we are paying for those costs now, whether it be under the present system or not.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I am asking this question because we were told by Mr. Dunton of the C.B.C. in Ottawa that, taking radio broadcasting alone, we had reached a certain plateau and that the expenses would not be substantially increased even

projecting the figures five or ten years; but he was referring to the present system, not acquiring other stations and developing these stations on a publicly-owned basis throughout the country.

PROF. REID: Obviously that was in the minds of the people who drafted the legislation, because there is an enabling clause in the Canadian Broadcasting Act.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Yes, but they have decided later, probably bearing in mind the cost of the venture, that they had to, and they were forced to go to private enterprise; but I think that I can state that, by and large, you have not given any particular thought to this problem of financing a publicly-owned system throughout Canada. Along the same lines have you also given thought to the financial capacity of Canada to support two networks running in parallel? In other words, would it be possible for Canadians to support a publicly-owned system, and would it also be possible for Canadians or Canadian interests to support a privately-owned system? Is there not a point of saturation?

PROF. REID: I would offer this as an answer: People who know a good deal more about the question of footing costs in Great Britain decided in the 30's it would not be possible for Britain to afford this duplication. If it is not possible in Britain where one signal can cover 95% of the population, I would think it would be even less possible here in Canada because of the geographic

-37-

difficulties.

MR. deGRANDPRE: So you would estimate that only one publicly-owned system and no private system at all ---

PROF. REID: For the foreseeable future it would seem to be that is about what the Canadian economy could afford.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I think we started on one point and we were finally led into another, and I don't think I have fully covered the question that I wanted to clarify first. My original question was about the regulating procedure that C.B.C. now follows, and we were led into its financing and so forth. The Station Relations department is responsible for enforcing the C.B.C. regulations. It actually enforces the regulations on C.B.C.-owned stations and private stations, and this is part of the executive pattern of the Corporation. Would you suggest that an enforcement division be created which would be answerable to the Board of Governors and not the management? Is this what you have in mind?

PROF. REID: If a division of that kind is made, yes.

PROF. McNAUGHT: May I say there -- as Mr. Reid said before, he was speaking for himself on that particular point and I don't think we were all agreed on that. One of the points of view expressed in the discussions was that the argument about two competing agencies operating side by side and one having authority to control the other was

a spurious argument, and that there is no ground whatsoever to talk about competing agencies in the field of broadcasting under the terms in which the people have established the Canadian Radio Act.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to ask the question as to where this competition lies; I am still waiting to be told where it lies, but going on on the point I think Mr. deGrandpre is just on, whether it is by a change in the administrative arrangements of the C.B.C. from the Station Relations department to some other enforcement department, you are saying that the problem and trouble with the C.B.C. is that they are not doing enough regulating?

PROF. REID: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you apply that even to regulating their own station?

PROF. REID: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Do I understand from your answer that the regulations are there but they are not properly enforced, or do you suggest more regulations on their books?

PROF. REID: Since obviously we do not think the regulating is being done properly, then I think we may assume that we disapprove of the regulatory function as it is now being exercised.

MR. deGRANDPRE: That there should be a re-drafting?

PROF. REID: Either the regulations are not sufficiently severe or the people charged with enforcing the regulations are lax in their en-

forcement.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Where are the regulations not severe enough?

PROF. REID: We think advertising, particularly.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Do you have any other complaints of laxity or looseness of the regulations?

PROF. REID: We have complaints; I am not sure they would be laxity of regulations. That is the one thing we had in mind -- advertising.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Too much advertising?

PROF. REID: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: That is the main complaint, yes, but do you have any ancillary complaints?

PROF. REID: Yes, that is not my main complaint with the quality of broadcasting in this city.

MR. deGRANDPRE: You mean the quality of the C.B.C. broadcasting or all broadcasting?

PROF. REID: The quality of both.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are talking now naturally about radio?

PROF. REID: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was this little private monitoring job you did this morning, was that on a radio station?

PROF. REID: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was it C.B.C. or private?

PROF. REID: It was a private station.

THE CHAIRMAN: A private station?

PROF. REID: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Was that taken at random?

PROF. REID: As a matter of fact, it was not. It was taken -- I used the station which seven people in conversation on Saturday night agreed on was the best.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Does that indicate the pattern which goes on for most of the day, or is it concentrated in the morning?

DR. LOCKHART: No, I think it is consistent -- it may vary. We would have to make other checks.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I stated, I don't know how great the detail would be able to be, but I stated in Ottawa that we were having various programme analyses made for both public and private stations, and we may get some help from these analyses as well as from the kind of informal checks which you made today.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Coming back to this question of more Canadianism on the C.B.C. broadcasts, would you limit this Canadianism to educational programmes or would you also include Canadianism in what we call the light entertainment -- I am not referring to the classical theatre and opera or shows of this nature, but I am referring to what is commonly called light entertainment. Would you say that it is also important to keep Canadian light entertainment, or would you suggest that in view of the heavy cost involved it should be discarded; as one witness said this morning, "I don't care whether my light entertainment comes from the United States

or Canada"?

PROF. REID: I would think in that particular field, light entertainment, that the possibilities of being Canadian as opposed to being anything else are very limited, so I would think it is a much less important factor in that particular field than it is in the field of educational broadcasting.

MR. deGRANDPRE: So, you are not concerned with the financial aspect, as I think the Commissioners will eventually be, but if there is anything to be discarded to reduce the cost you would be more inclined that this is where the cut should be made -- in the light entertainment field?

PROF. McNAUGHT: It depends how you define "light entertainment". If you are talking about popular legitimate theatre I would say that that would be a very bad place to start economy. The point was made by Mr. Priestley when he visited Winnipeg that Canada had slipped one cultural stage, that television should be parasitic upon a lively theatre, but that we had T.V. and no lively theatre, and therefore it was very obvious that the authorities should maintain a legitimate theatre in as many Canadian areas as possible upon which it could then draw for what I think would come under your description of "light entertainment".

MR. deGRANDPRE: Well, music hall shows and modern music and this type of entertainment.

PROF. REID: Surely a good national broadcasting fare will be balanced and will include

that sort of programme as well as the other kind.

DR. LOCKHART: We are concerned with the stimulation of Canadian talent and we recognize in Canada we suffer a problem due to the fact of our proximity to the United States, and it will always be a bit of a problem to us, and it seems to me we can only stimulate our own talent if we maintain the activities through the Corporation. We will never be able to compete with the sums of money that are poured into the American programmes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Would you suggest that all Canadian talent, wherever it is going to be exercised, should be encouraged by the Corporation?

PROF. REID: If it is talent, yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Well, that is my next question. It has been stated that we have reached a level of broadcasting of 50 or 55% of Canadian production. In your opinion do you think it is possible for broadcasting as a whole in Canada to reach a higher percentage of Canadian production, or will we strike the bottom of the barrel pretty soon -- not particularly in the performance field, but in the creative field or the script writers?

PROF. REID: I would point out if we were not living so close to the international border we would need to do it anyway; we would need to develop our own talent and programmes, not only 55%, but we would have to develop 100%.

PROF. McNAUGHT: One of the points that the gentleman whom you quoted made this morning

about being happy to take all his light entertainment from the States, is that you get the most obnoxious and debased kind of advertising that goes with it by definition. One of the things we were most concerned about was the apparent revolution of Canadian thought on the subject of whether it is acceptable to have unlimited advertising on the air -- a revolution from the time of Sir John Aird and the 1936 Commission. We were concerned to the counter-revolutionaries in that respect, and I think one of the primary aspects of encouraging and developing more Canadian talent is to have more shows available without the necessity of American commercial jingles and the other things that come with these light programmes from the States.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it from your brief on page 3 you have not got a very high opinion of the role so far carried by the private stations in cultural or educational fields?

PROF. REID: Not very high, no.

DR. LOCKHART: I think the same thing has happened in England since the change-over. The flood of programmes into Britain is primarily American, and the problem of maintaining English programmes of any standard is becoming increasingly difficult. Now, the same thing is happening here, and we have had this problem all the way through.

MR. deGRANDPRE: That is all, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a note here, and it may have been covered but I am not certain; on

the top of page 4 you are dealing with this problem of licensing and you suggest "an administrative re-organization to eliminate this objectionable system would be worthwhile although we are convinced that a regulatory power must be retained in the hands of a public body such as the Board of Governors of the C.B.C. If it were made clear to private radio and television interests that some sort of separation of the two powers of production and control is possible but that a surrender of either, or any part of either, by the state to private enterprise is not intended, we feel that a great deal of the righteous indignation of the proponents of independent commercial stations would vanish immediately." Would you care to expand that? I am not sure I get the point.

PROF. REID: I would think that it is fairly clear that a good deal of what we will call "righteous indignation" is indignation at the C.B.C. policy of refusing to give licenses to competing television stations, for example, here in Winnipeg. We simply have felt that if it were made quite clear that even if a license were granted to a private corporation to operate a television station in the City of Winnipeg that it would be faced with very severe regulations as to, for example, advertising content and quality of programming, and so on, that possibly the desire to change the present order may not be so vehement as it is now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, at the moment

-104-

an application for a license is not a matter for the C.B.C. to decide.

PROF. REID: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: A lot of people seem to think it is, but it is not; it is for the Minister of Transport, with the C.B.C. making various suggestions and contentions and recommendations.

PROF. REID: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: And in the only case where there was collision between the C.B.C. application for a T.V. station and a private station, it turned out that it was the private station that got the application. So, it does not look like the C.B.C. is making the decision.

PROF. REID: What we are particularly concerned about is the provision of a regulatory body which will ensure that we get possibly the right kind of broadcasting. That is the chief concern.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would like it to do the job it is supposed to be doing now?

PROF. REID: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Prof. Reid, with particular reference again to this suggestion of yours that the French network cease to be so exclusively French and the English network so exclusively English, do you not believe in parts of Canada, say, Manitoba in the West and parts where the listening public is very largely English-speaking, do you not anticipate a sort of public reaction against a body -- in this case the C.B.C. --

responsible for putting on French-language programmes at certain times of the day when they are not able to understand? I agree there is the minority that would be interested, but the vast majority unable to understand or unwilling to listen, would they not only switch off and complain about it?

PROF. REID: Well, it is quite clear that any policy will bring its detractors. The present policy brings its detractors now. My own experience has been in France the English-language network operated by American Armed Forces does on occasion present a French-language broadcast to its own listeners who are by the very nature of their occupation English-speaking. Some of these broadcasts are extremely skilful. It is a question of providing some interest which will carry along with it this instruction in the French-language. It is being done extremely skilfully and with a good deal of approval from the listeners.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You conceive these programmes are programmes in French where there is not too much dialogue or narration, but mostly music and some talk in French but not so much that a listener will be turning away from it, and thereby gradually getting a dose of French without an overdose?

PROF. REID: Yes. It is amazing how much French can be carried along on a thread of interest if there is a single theme that is being followed. That sort of thing is quite possible

in Canada.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Are there some English-speaking listeners to these radio programmes broadcast here from St. Boniface?

PROF. REID: I can tell you of one.

PROF. McNAUGHT: Two.

DR. LOCKHART: They are beamed to the French-speaking population. Occasionally they could be beamed to the English-speaking people, but there would be a difference in the programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I think we will take a five-minute recess.

---A short recess.

SUBMISSION OF THE NEWMAN CLUB ALUMNI
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. Francis Muldoon
Mr. George Goulet
Miss Bertha Vandersteen
Mr. Robert Bennett
Miss Therese de la Giroday

THE CHAIRMAN: The next submission we have is from the Newman Club Alumni of the University of Manitoba and I understand that is being presented by Mr. Francis Muldoon.

MR. MULDOON: That is correct, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your brief will be Exhibit No. 39, and will you now present it?

EXHIBIT NO. 39: Brief of the Newman Club Alumni of the University of Manitoba.

MR. MULDOON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I had better state the nature of our Association. It is a group of Catholic university graduates. There is also a Newman Club of the University which is for undergraduates, and we are the graduates -- the Alumni.

Our brief consists mostly of matters of morality and philosophy, and hence we are not entirely prepared to come forth with suggestions as to the economics or implementation, nor are we prepared to advocate or not advocate licensing and various technical matters of that sort.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we can leave those aside, then, Mr. Muldoon. For an organization

such as yours it is quite right and proper that it should confine itself to certain areas and not cover the whole field of our enquiries.

MR. MULDOON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had hoped not to be tempted beyond the scope of that. I could go through the brief paragraph by paragraph, if you wish.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MULDOON: The first paragraph is introductory.

Our main point is that television appeals to two senses, and that it comes into the home and that as such it is necessary that you take very great care in the selection of programmes for television. As we say, we are not here to criticise in detail the present programming content broadcast in Canada, in this part of the country, but this is more of an opinion, a word of caution, if you will, because of the particular nature of television.

There are too many open wounds in the body of today's society - wounds inflicted by the corruptive influences of a certain type of press, film and radio. I am sure it doesn't need elaboration, but we are all familiar with the yellow press and the particular types of publications on our news stands, and the programmes, commercially broadcast programmes which belittle public authority such as the Police force and the taking of the law into one's own hands in several instances, all, of course, to a good end, and justice always triumphs, but perhaps not by the best means.

We contend as well that television ought to

deal with wholesome matters of scientific, artistic or sporting activities or reporting occasions of State.

The contention is that television is at its best when it is being factual, and when it is, in effect, utilizing the full scope of its audio,, visual character.

As well it is contended that in doing these things, television programmes should attempt to inspire some sense of brotherhood and some sense of national unity and some sense of multiple culture such as we have in Canada.

The fact that television is brought directly into the home we regard as a very important aspect of it: the fact that children are watching television probably throughout the whole day's broadcasting, and that very great care must be taken in establishing the content of television programmes. We think there is possibly a foible herein, and that is to be found at the bottom of page two in the brief.

Freedom of artistic expression is doubtless productive of great creativeness and cultural development and hence, generally commendable, but unbridled, or even thoughtlessly exercised freedom in television arts may be dangerous. Freedom of artistic expression is good, but the preservation of the purity of family life is unquestionably a greater good. Therefore television programme producers should guard jealously their responsibility to protect the home from the vivid sound and visual sensations of unrestricted artistic or so-called artistic expression.

We then go on, and it is quoted in the brief, with the exhortation of His Holiness Pope Pius the 12th

concerning the programming and content of television broadcasting, and we note that a responsible self-regulation is to be preferred to imposed censorship, and this is our contention. As to the mechanics of implementing such responsible self-regulation, we have no concrete suggestions. We feel that the suggestion should be made, that the opinion should be expressed to this Commission, particularly since broadcasting in Canada is a matter of Federal jurisdiction and not subject to Provincial censorship.

We feel as well that the so-called distinctively adult programmes, if there are such, ought to be scheduled for the later hours of each day's broadcast, even though children are still viewing television probably throughout the whole of the day's broadcast, fewer will undoubtedly be amongst the television audience at these hours, and we suggest that there is no need for an invariable late evening of preponderance and distinctively adult programmes, but rather than programmes of a general character which are both interesting and educational and which utilize the distinct visual character of television are to be preferred.

So far this may have seemed overly cautious and too much of a word of warning, but we suggest a laudible positive criterion, how does the programme contribute to emotional stability, social adjustment and spiritual development - how does it enhance the ethical and moral concepts of the viewers.

I don't know if the Commission has a copy of the pamphlet entitled, "Hearings before the Sub Committee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the

Committee on the Judiciary United States Senate - 84th Congress". That pamphlet concerns itself with juvenile delinquency and the relation between juvenile delinquency and television programming.

THE CHAIRMAN: We can certainly get that.

MR. MULDOON: I think you can.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have given us the reference and it is something we should probably take a look at.

MR. MULDOON: Our brief is then concluded with the words, "let us so pass through the good things of the present as not to lose those of eternity", and I think this is a point which may well be taken.

If there are any questions...?

MR. deGRANDPRE: I take it, Mr. Muldoon, that your brief is to be taken more as a warning bell than as a specific complaint that you have against the Corporation?

MR. MULDOON: That is quite right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you will understand that because of your opening remarks, not wishing to be led into other phases of our enquiry, and since you have said this was by way of warning, and is of a philosophical character, there is not a great deal we could or should ask you.

MR. MULDOON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will not think, though, that because we don't ask you that we are uninterested in your brief?

MR. MULDOON: Not at all, Mr. Chairman. We felt we should appear before you in case there any

questions to be asked publicly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you all very much for coming. We are grateful to you for your interest.

WINNIPEG SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA LIMITED

APPEARANCES:

MR. C. I. KEITH, Q.C.

MR. L. DAVIS.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is on behalf of the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra Limited and I understand that Mr. C. I. Keith, Q.C. is here, and you have with you who, Mr. Keith?

MR. KEITH: Mr. Lawrence Davis, the Manager of the Orchestra.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your brief will be exhibit 40, and we appreciate having you here.

--EXHIBIT No. 40: Brief of Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra Limited.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Keith, when you are ready will you present the brief you have submitted?

MR. KEITH: The Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1947 by a group of public spirited citizens who actively solicited support and assistance for the project from a large number of individuals, firms and organizations in Greater Winnipeg.

The response to their appeal was most encouraging, and speaks well for the genuine and widespread desire of Canadians for cultural projects of this kind.

It is perhaps a little unfair to single out any particular individual, firm or organization and give special credit to him or it for the success of the orchestra up to date. However, the members of the Board of Directors felt that on the occasion of the

visit of your Commission to our City it would be only right and proper to tell you about the role played by the CBC in this regard.

From the very beginning, the CBC organization and Mr. James Finlay, its Western Regional Director, gave the orchestra wholehearted support.

It might even be said that without this co-operation and support it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to have organized the orchestra.

The initial drive for membership opened in May 1947 at the Playhouse Theatre with a concert which was provided and underwritten by the CBC. This concert featured the Winnipeg String Orchestra, a CBC aggregation, which at that time was the only orchestra available in the city.

At that time there were a number of key instruments in the brass and woodwind sections which were not available in the city. It was only through the co-operation of the CBC, the Winnipeg Musicians' Association and the newly formed Symphony Orchestra Board, that these key players were subsequently brought to Winnipeg and have been maintained here ever since.

In the Fall of 1947 a second concert was given, and by this time a few of the key players had been brought in and seven players of the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra and a guest conductor from Minneapolis combined to present a very excellent programme, again with the assistance and support of the CBC.

A third concert was given in May 1948 by the CBC Augmented Orchestra under the direction of Sir Ernest MacMillan. This concert was presented in

the Winnipeg Auditorium with an attendance of approximately three thousand people and resulted in sufficient support being pledged to enable the orchestra to commence operations on a regular, permanent basis.

In the Fall of 1948 the orchestra opened the first season of concerts and it has carried on ever since. In addition to regular subscription series each year, it has presented a series of afternoon concerts for the schoolchildren of Manitoba.

These concerts have been broadcast over the National network of the CBC, and the revenue from this source has been a great assistance to the orchestra in carrying on its work. It would not have been possible for the orchestra to have reached its present high calibre without the co-operation and financial support of the CBC.

For this reason the members of the Board of Directors, and the music lovers of Manitoba, are most anxious that the CBC should continue to carry on the important work of encouraging, fostering and supporting Canadian musical talent.

We feel that radio is a medium which will continue to serve a need and to fulfill a function in Canada regardless of the development of television stations and programmes. There are certain types of programme that are just as well presented on radio as on television. News, commentaries and music, particularly orchestral music fall into this category.

It is easier to listen to a Symphony Orchestra which is carefully broadcast, without the distraction of

a camera wandering willy nilly over an assortment of players engaged in the exacting and complicated mechanics of their profession. Such pictures add little or nothing to the enjoyment of the performance, and more often than not they distract and detract from the pleasure of the music.

We feel that if the object of the Government of Canada is to build up and encourage cultural background and atmosphere for Canadian life, projects such as the Symphony Orchestra are a basic necessity. Furthermore, the most practical and commonsense method to encourage local artists, musicians, actors, dancers, etc., is a method at present used through the medium of the CBC.

The CBC has been, and is at present, a major factor in the development of Canadian culture. It would be a serious blow if this work, which has been so successfully begun and so ably carried on, were to be dropped or even impaired or curtailed.

We consider that the CBC has been a most valuable contribution to cultural endeavour. The older countries of Europe, placing greater importance on this phase of their national life, have for many generations considered cultural matters an essential part of governmental responsibility. Government support of symphony orchestra, art galleries, ballet groups and similar undertakings has long been an accepted practice in Europe. We consider it is a mark of our own cultural growth that the Government of Canada has in recent years recognized, in a modest way, and

through the CBC, some responsibility in this field.

Perhaps we should conclude by indicating our views on financing the CBC, since this is one of the major points upon which you have been asked to report.

It is the view of the Board of Directors of the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra that:

1. The chief function of the CBC should be to foster, encourage, support and present all possible elements of our national life of a musical, historical and dramatic nature which might in any way contribute to a distinctive Canadian culture.
2. This is of importance to all Canadians individually wherever they may live and to Canada as a nation.
3. That this worthy undertaking should be financed as a national project, out of the Federal Treasury, in the same way that other national projects are financed.
4. That the amount or extent of the support for the CBC should not be measured by or dependent upon the number of television sets or radio sets or vacuum tubes sold or imported into Canada. Furthermore that any attempt to relate these two matters is an entirely wrong approach to the problem.
5. If the Government of Canada recognizes and declares the CBC to be an instrument

and means of encouraging and developing cultural activities in Canada, and appropriates funds for this purpose, it will place the CBC on a proper and forthright basis. Trying to make this organization an economic or even semi-economic undertaking puts it under a handicap which interferes with its basic function. It also places the CBC in competition with private enterprise, which in turn subjects it to unfair and unnecessary criticism, which always results from trying to ride two horses at the same time.

6. The Canadian economy is sufficiently buoyant at the present time to support an independent national network (that is independent of paid advertising) devoted to fostering and supporting cultural activities across Canada. If money can be found and allocated for roads, aeroplanes, hospitals, art galleries, atomic weapons, mortgage loans, National parks, a National Film Board and other similar undertakings, there should not be any difficulty in supporting a national network of radio and TV stations dedicated to the cause of Canadian culture.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything to your written brief, Mr. Keith, or either of you?

MR. KEITH: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Could you tell me, Mr. Keith, from a practical standpoint whether it is more expensive for the CBC to televise a symphonic concert, or does it cost the same price to the CBC to put it on a sound broadcast?

MR. KEITH: I would think the television is very much more expensive than sound.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Therefore, would you suggest that television should be banned from symphonic concerts?

MR. KEITH: Not at all, no.

MR. deGRANDPRE: You feel that symphonic concerts should be on television no matter to what extent it will distract or detract the viewer?

MR. KEITH: I think that is a matter for the internal organization of the CBC to decide itself. I would think that they would occasionally broadcast them, but I don't think it is necessary.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That is a matter of personal preference?

MR. KEITH: Yes, I would rather listen on the radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have heard it personally suggested that radio is more or less on the way out and television is the rising medium. You would, I think, on this argument say that radio had a continuing and important place in this area?

MR. KEITH: I think very definitely it has, and whether we theorize about it or not, it will be with us for very many years; perhaps for ever, but I don't

think it will disappear.

THE CHAIRMAN: On page 2 of your brief you were referring to the way in which the orchestra in Winnipeg got going and, in fact, in several places you used the phrase, "With the assistance and support of the CBC"?

MR. KEITH: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you tell me what that support and assistance consisted of?

MR. KEITH: As I tried to point out, they underwrote the first three concerts which were given free of charge but with the object of people attending them, buying a share in the new company to enable it to get started. Secondly, the big thing, and the big way it does co-operate today with the orchestra - in fact, there were some who thought we should indicate that the CBC needed us just as much as we needed them, and to some extent that is right. It is impossible to keep key players of the more difficult and unusual instruments in a city unless the players are given a means of making a living, and the orchestra provides only part of that means in Winnipeg, and the CBC provides the other part. They need those players and we need them, and both together we are able, and have been able, to build up a very respectable musical organization in Winnipeg, and it is not only the individual who was brought here. We brought them here jointly by more or less assuring them of a livelihood, and a number of musicians who were not in this city before, and there was no-one who could play those

instruments; not only the players came, but they teach, and now children are learning the instruments. The Symphony Orchestra went out of existence in Manitoba for a number of years and immediately what happened was that most of the better players in the key instruments moved to other places such as the United States, Toronto, Montreal, and there is a whole era in the musical life of Winnipeg due to the migration of these people, not only of themselves, but there were no pupils; nobody was staying and there was no means of filling that gap in which has now been replaced by working together, and this is a very important thing the CBC has done for this community.

THE CHAIRMAN: After the first three concerts which got the new organization going, you say that you opened a seasonal concert period and it has carried on ever since, you say?

MR. KEITH: Quite.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the carrying on, I take it you get subscription fees from your various members?

MR. KEITH: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose you sell some tickets for the concert outside your members?

MR. KEITH: Oh yes, quite.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you also have contributions over and above for the support---

MR. KEITH: Yes,, we have a foundation fund and contributions are solicited.

THE CHAIRMAN: What, since the opening free concerts, does the CBC contribute in terms of revenue?

MR. KEITH: Well, that increased. Naturally, in the beginning when the orchestra was very young, the broadcast was restricted to the local area. It wasn't, frankly, of a calibre that I think the CBC thought justified a national broadcast. However, with the passage of a couple of years, the standard of the orchestra did reach a point where the CBC put it on the National network, and latterly on the International network. It is broadcast all over the United States as well through the mutual system, and the fee that has been paid per concert has been increased year by year until now we are receiving the same as Montreal and Toronto symphony.

THE CHAIRMAN: These orchestras, of which Winnipeg is an example, when the CBC carries them on the National or International system, they pay you a fee?

MR. KEITH: Yes, each player receives an additional fee based on the rates that are in effect between the Musicians' Association and the CBC, and if it is a local broadcast, the rate is so much, and if it is a National or International broadcast they receive more. Of course, from the point of view of our orchestra, as long as the players receive a payment, that is what we want to see. We want to maintain a musician, and we want to see they can make a living and that they are happy and successful.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the actual payment by the CBC is to the orchestras which play on the broadcasting programme?

MR. KEITH: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not a payment direct to the Symphony Association?

MR. KEITH: Yes, it is a payment to the Symphony Association, but we in turn must pay the musicians according to the undertaking with the Association.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did the orchestra, either in its organizational period or since it has been operating, in fact receive any assistance from the private radio stations?

MR. KEITH: Yes, very considerable assistance in announcements urging people to support it and also in definite programmes that were put on the air as recorded programmes of symphonic music; our business manager and conductor, and so forth -- not entirely, as you might say, commercial programmes, but programmes illustrating the music that was to be played at, say, the next concert, and explaining it, and so forth.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you put that in the category of what you might call advertising help?

MR. KEITH: It is advertising help, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did they, in fact, make any contributions of a monetary sort to the Symphony?

MR. KEITH: Well, some of the individuals who were associated with these stations ---

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I am talking about similar to what the CBC has done?

MR. KEITH: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did they, in fact, pay you for certain programmes that they carried?

MR. KEITH: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: They used recordings, you say, in most instances when they were actually playing symphonic music?

MR. KEITH: That is right.

MR. deGRANDPRE: We have heard conflicting opinions to day about the light entertainment field and you touched this point at the bottom of page 4 of your brief. You say:

"The chief function of the CBC should be to foster, encourage, support and present all possible elements of our national life of a musical, historical and dramatic nature which might in any way contribute to a distinctive Canadian culture."

What is your opinion about light entertainment, do you think it is included in a distinctive Canadian culture or do you agree with the statement made this morning by one of the persons who presented a brief that as far as light entertainment is concerned he does not mind whther it is all Canadian or American origin.

MR. KEITH: Well, I think the speaker from the University here, Mr. Reid, sort of touched on that subject. He, I think, indicated the views of the Board on this subject and I think will have some more to say about that in the brief tomorrow. My feeling is that the approach to programming, I do not think it is up to us to say how the CBC should programme, but I do feel that they should try as they have been, I think quite

honestly, to get the best of Canadian entertainment, that is, musical, ballet, drama, whatever they can do, and by "best" I mean professional entertainment and of a calibre that is worth looking at from an entertainment point of view. I mean, I cannot see the CBC running around fostering little theatres and amateur string quartets, I think if people want to do that, that is fine, but if they would see that professional musicians, professional dancers, professional entertainers in Canada were used purely on the basis of their ability to entertain and to make a worthwhile programme for Canadians to look at, that that should be their first objective. I do not think we have enough talent to take up 12 to 14 hours a day so with all the balance of the time that is left they obviously have to go, or should go, abroad, meaning probably, I suppose, the United States, and then take the best of what is available there, keeping in mind what has been presented or is being presented by Canadians and trying to round out a twelve or twenty-four hours a day schedule of interesting programmes and only after they have done that - I mean, there is no need of it, of them going to import a mediocre programme from United States, we have lots of that right here and we do not have to import that. Let them import the best regardless of how much revenue they get out of it and having done those two things, then they come down to the question of what time they have left still not allocated, then, I would go out and take that time on the basis of the most money that they could make out of it. I think the approach has been the other way, the CBC has said

that they have got to have money, they have got to buy these big international programmes from the United States because advertisers pay them money and if they do not carry these they won't have enough money to dole out to the Canadians. I think Mr. Reid was getting at that same approach, it might result in the same thing in the end but I do not think so, and I do not think the CBC should be placed in the position where they have got to find money to do these other projects which is apparently the approach which has been in vogue up to the present time. I do not say that is the CBC's fault, they have been put in that position and I do not think they should be in that position. I think those things should be attended to first and our government ought to come right out with it, there is nothing shameful about supporting music, ballet and drama, it is done all over the world and they subsidize it and if we do that, and if the Government says they will do that, I think the CBC is the best medium for doing it, because I think the people who are running this CBC are pretty sound, practical men when it comes to sizing up entertainment values and cultural values. I would hate to see some kind of a, as was suggested by one of the speakers, a sort of a board made up of professors and musicians to devise programmes that the public will be forced to look at, heaven preserve us from that sort of thing. I think the CBC have set up an organization, and if they have the money they can do the job. Maybe they were not originally set up to do it, but I think they can do the job and a good job.

MR. deGRANDPRE: In a nutshell, I understand from your remarks you underwrite the brief that was presented by Professor Reid this afternoon and no matter what the cost will be, you want this to be done?

MR. KEITH: Yes, it should be done definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just on that point, in the middle of page 5, you say:

"Trying to make this organization an economic or even semi-economic undertaking puts it under a handicap which interferes with its basic function."

I take it you use that word economic in the sense of self-supporting?

MR. KEITH: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Rather than any suggestion that out of the efforts they are making you would agree they should be businesslike and sensible as they can be.

MR. KEITH: Yes, and I think they are too, by and large, I think they are essentially a business organization and have done a good job.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to be clear on that.

MR. KEITH: That is what I mean.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for presenting this, Mr. Keith; did you say you were coming back to see us tomorrow?

MR. KEITH: A couple of times.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will be pleased to see you.

THE RED RIVER T.V. ASSOCIATION.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand the next brief is to be presented by Mr. Johnston of the Red River T.V. Association. This brief will be marked as Exhibit 41.

---EXHIBIT No. 41: Brief of Red River T.V. Association.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yours is a brief that is small in volume so we will get on with it this afternoon and if it takes too long we will continue tomorrow.

MR. JOHNSTON: Usually in the presentation of a brief I like to introduce it, but I think probably we can make better time if I read this, it is so short.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think so.

MR. JOHNSTON: I might say that the purpose of this brief is single-fold which I hope will develop as we read the second page. This is a brief, Chairman and gentlemen, on behalf of the Red River T.V. Association. The management group of the Red River T.V. Association appreciates this opportunity of presenting the views of our association to the members of the Commission. For your information, we are representing in this matter, an association of some 16 business men who have widespread interests in greater Winnipeg and a definite concern in the economic future and welfare of Manitoba. I think it is always helpful when you are operating under the name of an association to know exactly who is behind the association and with your permission, I would like to file a list of the members of the Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, we will mark that as Exhibit No. 42.

---EXHIBIT No. 42: List of members of the Red River
T. V. Association.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a formal association,
have you by-laws and a charter?

MR. JOHNSTON: We have not as yet been
incorporated. Before proceeding with the rest of our
brief, may I just read this list?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. JOHNSTON: I would say that in this
list we have shown the chief business interest of
each individual together with his favourite community
enterprise outside of his economic life.

C. GORDON SMITH

Managing Director, Smith Vincent & Co.Ltd.
Vice President, Board of Trustees, Winnipeg
General Hospital.

J. ELMER WOODS

President, The Monarch Life Assurance Company
Member, Board of Governors, St.John's-
Ravenscourt School.

JOSEPH HARRIS, LL.D.

President, The Great-West Life Assurance Company.
Honorary Governor, Dominion Drama Festival.

PHILIP A. CHESTER.

Managing Director, Hudson's Bay Company;
Chairman, Finance Committee, Winnipeg
General Hospital.

VICTOR SIFTON, C.B.E.,LL.D., D.S.O.

Publisher, Winnipeg Free Press.
Chancellor, University of Manitoba.

RODERICK A. COPLAND

President, Oldfield, Kirby & Gardner Limited.
Member, Advisory Board, The Winnipeg Foundation.

STEWART A. SEARLE.

President, Searle Grain Company Limited.
Member, Board of Governors, Winnipeg Art
Gallery.
Member, Board of Trustees, Winnipeg General
Hospital.

HUBERT J. BIRD

Chairman of the Board, Bird Construction Co.Ltd.
Member of Council, St.John's College.

WILLIAM A. JOHNSTON, Q.C.

Barrister.

Chairman, Board of Governors, Shriners
Hospital for Crippled Children.

RICHARD S. MALONE, O.B.E., E.D.

Vice President, Winnipeg Free Press

Member of the Council, The Winnipeg Chamber
of Commerce.

ROBERT E. MOORE, F.R.A.I.C.

Partner, Moody & Moore, Architects.

HERBERT H.G. MOODY, F.R.A.I.C.

Partner, Moody & Moore, Architects.

Provincial Chairman, Manitoba Committee of
the Army Benevolent Fund.

JOHN A. MacAULAY, Q.C., LL.D.

Barrister.

President, Winnipeg Art Gallery; Member,
Board of Trustees, National Art Gallery.

Honorary Vice President, Canadian Red Cross
Society.

CLIFFORD L. SIFTON, D.S.O.

Publisher, Regina Leader Post.

Owner, Radio Station CKRC, Winnipeg.

KENNETH A. POWELL

President, K.A. Powell (Canada) Ltd.

Advisory Council, Boy Scout Association.

WILLIAM A. SPEERS

Manager, Radio Station CKRC, Winnipeg.

Member of Management Committee, Manitoba
Division, Canadian Red Cross.

THE CHAIRMAN: Somewhere we have heard about
some of those people.

MR. JOHNSTON: I think so, Mr. Chairman.

We give you this statement in order that you may
appreciate what has motivated this group of individuals
to take an interest in television. Before submitting
our views, we would first like the members of the
Commission to know, that the specific purpose of our
association is to develop a television station in
this area as soon as a licence can be obtained for the
construction and operation of the same. This purpose

has been duly registered with government authorities in Ottawa with the request that our application be considered as and when such applications may be accepted. In light of these facts, it could be interpreted quite properly that our association is motivated by a measure of self-interest. For this reason, therefore, we would refrain from offering our views on matters of general CBC policy.

It is only under Section F. of your Commission's terms of reference that we wish to make any representations and record our views. We believe that the Commission during its hearings in Winnipeg will have no difficulty in establishing the fact that this community is strongly in favour of an alternative, privately owned television station.

We are anxious, however, that the Commission does not form any opinions that, while many public groups in Manitoba favour an alternative television outlet, such ideas are simply theoretical or visionary and not practical from a standpoint of local financing or private initiative. The business men of our association are quite prepared to find the risk capital involved in organizing a television station in Greater Winnipeg. They have already contracted themselves to subscribe sufficient funds to develop such a station, when permission has been granted. They have, in addition, carried out certain engineering surveys and secured suitable property for such a project.

In conclusion, we would like to stress our view that an additional television station is important to the future development of this area, not only from

the standpoint of the electronics industry and retail business, but also towards Winnipeg's growth in such matters as music, art, education and general community enterprise.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Johnston, could you tell me is this a business venture or is it some form of public service that this group is up to in this?

MR. JOHNSTON: It is two-fold, sir, this group, their first thinking was for public service, that is why we have given you this interest of each member of the group, being businessmen they are hoping that in the performing of that public service they can do it in a successful business manner but that is second to their original thinking.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the public service content of their thinking?

MR. JOHNSTON: They feel that there is a necessity for another outlet - this is a subject which I had not intended discussing with you, but we feel it will be amply demonstrated by the publicity that has been given in the City of Winnipeg, it will be amply demonstrated that it is the desire of the citizens of Winnipeg that they be served with an additional outlet. One reason for that being that we are in a sort of geographical island in many respects, the only city of our size in Canada. In Toronto, for instance, while they have one outlet they can obtain other stations, other channels, but that is impossible in Winnipeg. This group have no fight with the CBC, they merely wish to provide that service which they

feel is a necessity and they feel is a service, that is the desire of this community and the only purpose of our submission here, as I say, is that if you have other submissions and if the result of these submissions is such that you see there is a need, then we wish to assure you that there is a group ready to go on with it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now on this point about public opinion in favour of it, they desire to have this station, that undoubtedly is relevant but doesn't the really relevant fact under clause F of the powers you quote ---

MR. JOHNSTON: That is quite true.

THE CHAIRMAN: Because we have to consider the licensing control of television and sound broadcasting stations in the public interest. Now, I suppose you would be the first person to recognize that the principle of the alternate station is not something that can be applied solely to Winnipeg.

MR. JOHNSTON: I would have to agree with you, Mr. Chairman, I might add this, that probably there is quite a little or quite an extended reason for it in Winnipeg that probably does not apply to other places.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you touched on that a moment ago.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But once you start to do that for one place, say, Winnipeg, it would be pretty hard not to do it for other places where a similar local

desire exists.

MR. JOHNSTON: I think so, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the operation of such an alternative station in Winnipeg, does your group think of it as being a completely separate operation or do you expect to receive programmes from the CBC?

MR. JOHNSTON: Initially, we would not expect to receive programmes from the CBC at the expense of the CBC, if the CBC was desirous of --

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us put it this way, that the CBC having an outlet here, it would appear if it is already a sufficient outlet for them --

MR. JOHNSTON: If they were desirous of using our facilities for some of their programmes, in addition to the facilities that they had, we would have no objection to that if they felt it was desirable to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you feel, Mr. Johnston, that the new T.V. station would be subject to regulation as to programme content and so forth?

MR. JOHNSTON; Well, we are getting into a field that I had not intended to discuss, but I would presume a certain amount of regulation would always be necessary. Then, the word "regulation" of course depends on what we mean by that and who the regulation is for.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, for instance, let me try you out on something, because I do not think it is irrelevant, it goes to the very question you are asking us to make some recommendation on, would your group be prepared to accept a limitation on the

advertising content of a programme?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, we would accept that regulation if it was to be a regulation that did not create an unfair situation to ourselves. In other words, if it was a regulation that was applicable or in line with the regulations or the governing body of the other station operating here, I think we would accept it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you be prepared, on another point, to accept a regulation, let us say, a fairly substantial percentage of your programme should be of Canadian origin?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you expect to operate this as a business success?

MR. JOHNSTON: We are hopeful of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. deGrandpre?

MR. deGRANDPRE: You have covered all the points I intended to cover, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, I got started and was carried away.

MR. de GRANDPRE: The end result was right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Johnston, I feel I owe an apology to Mr. deGrandpre for having taken the questions away from him but we appreciate your coming.

MR. JOHNSTON: I might say if any other questions develop, we would be delighted to endeavour to answer them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Since this is at the end of the day, maybe if we do have some other questions as we go

along through the next two days, we will send you a message.

MR. JOHNSTON: Fine, I appreciate this is probably a little different from the other briefs that have been received and if there is anything further we can contribute we will be glad to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn now until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

---The Commission adjourned at 4.50 o'clock.

INDEX

<u>SUBMISSION OF:</u>	<u>Page</u>
COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG ...	876
Alderman Albert Bennett	
Alderman Douglas Chisholm	
WINNIPEG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ...	904
Mr. E. McCormick	
Mr. W. Faulder	
Mr. R. Brenning	
MANITOBA FARMERS UNION ...	931
Mr. J. Patterson	
Mr. J.N. Galonsky	
MANITOBA FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE AND COOPERATION ...	951
Mr. Paul Terko	
Mr. J.T. McLean	
GENERAL FACULTY COUNCIL OF UNITED COLLEGE, WINNIPEG ...	972
Dr. W.C. Lockhart	
Prof. J.H.S. Reid	
Prof. K.W. McNaught	
THE NEWMAN CLUB ALUMNI OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA ...	1007
Mr. Francis Muldoon	
Mr. George Goulet	
Miss Bertha Vandersteen	
Mr. Robert Bennett	
Miss Therese de la Giroday	
WINNIPEG SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA LIMITED ...	1013
Mr. C.I. Keith, Q.C.	
Mr. L. Davis	
THE RED RIVER T.V. ASSOCIATION ...	1027
Mr. Johnston	

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
34	Brief of the Council of the City of Winnipeg.	878
35	Brief of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce	904
36	Brief of the Manitoba Farmers Union	931
37	Brief of the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture and Cooperation	951
38	Brief of the General Faculty Council of United College, Winnipeg	972
39	Brief of the Newman Club Alumni of the University of Manitoba	1007
40	Brief of Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra Limited	1013

ROYAL COMMISSION
ON
BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

WINNIPEG, MAN.

MAY 8, 1956

v. 7

Winnipeg, Manitoba
May 8, 1956,
10 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

C.K.R.C. WINNIPEG

Mr. Clifford Sifton

Mr. Wm. A. Speers

RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

Mr. C. I Keith, Q.C.

Mr. D. A. Gilbert

LABOR PROGRESSIVE PARTY - MANITOBA COMMITTEE

Mr. W.C. Ross

Mr. R. Pennor

CANADIAN COSTURMERS

Mr. C. I Keith, Q.C.

Mr. Ross Malabar

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, today we have eight or nine briefs to hear and the first is a brief filed and presented by C.K.R.C. Winnipeg to be presented by Mr. Clifford Sifton and Mr. William A. Speers. We will begin by filing the brief as exhibit 43.

EXHIBIT 43: Brief presented by station C.K.R.C. Winnipeg.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sifton, would you like to proceed?

MR. SIFTON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should explain that in effect I am the owner of the station, Mr. Speers is the publisher or manager, whatever you like to call him. Mr. Speers comes into contact with the business and there may be certain things you may want to ask that I would rather he answer than I. As far the brief is concerned it falls into Mr. Speers sphere and I would ask him to present the brief and answer any questions and between the two of us we will make ourselves available to you for any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: As you noticed yesterday we want at least a small outline of the points of the brief and you may handle it the best way you think and when we come to the questions we will deal with that.

MR. SPEERS: This is a very short brief and it may be better for me to read it than to summarize it. Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission since we are advising you that we would be presenting a brief to the commission, we have had an opportunity to examine the brief presented by the CANADAIN ASSOCIATION OF RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTERS. This seems to us to be a very complete and careful presentation of our views and it occurs to us that it would be an imposition to ask the commission to read them over again in another brief. We should like, therefore, simply to endorse the brief of the association and to urge your

favourable consideration of the recommendations it contains.

At the same time, we feel that we might be of some help to the Commission by offering in as concise form as possible an outline of the operation of C.K.R.C. as a community service, operating in the public interest. We believe that the long term success of any enterprise is governed by its ability to be of service to the community in which it operates.

C.K.R.C. began operations in August 1928, when it operated with a studio in Winnipeg and its transmitter located 200 miles away at Fleming, Saskatchewan with the call letters C.J.R.W. In 1933 the transmitter was moved to Winnipeg and it was licenced to operate at 100 watts with the call letters C.J.R.C. In 1936 the power was increased to 1000 watts. In 1943 the call letters were changed to C.K.R.C. In 1947 the power was again increased from 1000 to 5000 watts. The present owners of the station have operated it since 1940. Mr. Chairman, in the brief you will notice there is a lot of detail which I will not go into at the present time. May we in closing refer again to the CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTERS. At its recent annual meeting the association passed a resolution pledging its member stations to assist the commission with any information which they could supply as a member station we would like to say again anything we can do

in this respect with regard to C.K.R.C. we shall most gladly and willingly do.

THE CHAIRMAN: The rest of your brief contains some appendices and testimonials.

MR. SPEERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to expand on those any further?

MR. SPEERS: Not unless you wish us to, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Speers, in the first paragraph of your brief you support and endorse the brief that has already been presented by the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters.

MR. SPEERS: Yes, sir.

MR. COYNE: In the brief one of the two principal recommendations was the establishment of an independent regulatory board with jurisdiction over all the radio and broadcasting stations whether privately or publicly owned, in connection with that proposal would you tell us whether in your view the recommendation of an independent board is merely a question of shifting the regulatory functions from the C.B.C. Board of Governors or do you contemplate having changes in the regulations? Do you recommend any changes in the present regulations?

MR. SPEERS: My view on it is this, my primary view on it is this, that having the regulation

in a separate regulatory board would create a much better atmosphere in the current broadcasting in Canada both between private broadcasting and the C.B.C. and as between the public and the C.B.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: To put it another way are there any present regulations which you regard as unduly onerous or unfair?

MR. SIFTON: Perhaps I can comment on that; we very definitely do not want to appear to be shooting at somebody else.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a good place to shoot, you know.

MR. SIFTON: I understand that but we know the C.B.C. people well and like them. We think the system is wrong, we think the system tends to encumber and limit the jobs which we can do. If it was changed we are recommending changes of which we think are in the public interest, which we think would make us a little freer to serve the public with a little more imagination and ingenuity and variety, and to put it in a simple word, better. We think there are some things, perhaps I could mention one or two which would not be unkind and it is a shooting at people I want to avoid but what we have in mind is a system which we think is in the public interest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will accept that but you used a phrase, you say that the present system

I take of regulations, tends to encumber and limit the job you are doing.

MR. SIFTON: Yes. I can give you a couple of instances. For a long time, at the moment it is not important, we were under a regulation which said during the best hours of the evening we could only have roughly speaking half of it transcribed. When this was on the people who were on the government network were carrying the top entertainment programmes largely imported from the United States, yet the private broadcasters who had to broadcast at the same time were put in the position where for half the time at least they had to some way or other produce some kind of a local show and endeavour to serve the public with that. In our view it is unrealistic, it is not in the public interest, if it is in any interest it is in the interest of the fellow importing the top show but not in the public interest. Why should not the competitor put up a good show because during those hours that is what the national system carried, and, of course, the private people cannot share the costs and put them on a number of places for instance---

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that, if this particular regulation you are talking about was changed it would mean it would have a larger proportion of transcribed shows.

MR. SIFTON: At the moment it is not to important on radio there are not too many of those

'big shows brought in any longer. I am deliberately taking a case which is non controversial because, as I say I want to avoid things which might be considered to be sour grapes or something of the kind, I am trying to elicit my opinion in the present arrangement and it tended in the past to be, from the point of view of providing conditions where the public can get the most imaginative service. The second one I mention in that same tenure is the question of simultaneous broadcasting; and now, the national broadcasting system has and exercises, a monopoly on network broadcasting. I would have no objection to them having national broadcasting, they may or may not be the only people who can do it, certainly I can see nothing which makes it in the public interest that nobody else shall ever have that kind of a show of a similar sort if they are able to do it. It is not a question of interfering with the network but something that is in the public interest. That was tried on one occasion when somebody thought it would be interesting because they could attract a bigger audience by putting a broadcast on the other station at the same time; promptly a regulation was passed that you cannot do indirectly that which you cannot do directly. It was not suggested it was not in the public interest, if there was any reason for it, it might be deemed to be just imagination because no reason was given, it would be

merely for the protection of the one service. And now why other means of serving the public should be suppressed or partly suppressed or made more difficult---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Are you saying you were denied the right to operate on a network?

MR. SIFTON: No, I do not mean the network because we have been on occasions, of course we have applied to hook-up stations, not very recently because there is no use of doing it but years ago we did every once in a while.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: How many years ago?

MR. SIFTON: Oh, several, but it is a different thing it is a question of not applying to connect your wires as a network at all, it was a question of transcribing a programme and then having it broadcast on a number of private stations at the same time and this is verboten. With all due deference we do not think it is in the public interest, it is one of the things, I do not want to pick out individual pieces I am giving you two which I think would be non controversial at the moment for the purpose of eliciting the point.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Of course, I asked the question because in Ottawa a question, well not exactly the same question came up but a somewhat similar question came up and ultimately we discovered

one had applied actually to the C.B.C. for the right of network time because they thought it would not be granted.

MR. SIFTON: Well, in the past, it has not been granted and that is the best reason in the world for supposing that.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That was the reason I asked you how long ago you had applied and been refused.

MR. SIFTON: That is several years.

THE CHAIRMAN: In addition to that, it was definitely stated that there was in existence what amounted to a regional network for certain programmes in the Maritime Provinces so the notion of some form of either simultaneous broadcast or network is not, in fact, completely outside the realm of possibility in the present C.B.C. operations.

MR. SIFTON: With all due deference I am not suggesting that anything is out of the realm of possibility but I am suggesting the present system tends in the direction of unnecessary restriction of private enterprise, ingenuity in the broadcasting field, and in our opinion and with a good deal of experience to back it up we respectfully submit and urge that we would like to get a regulation which will result in private enterprise doing a better job for the public if it is to be in the hands of an independent board.

THE CHAIRMAN: How do you measure a better job?

MR. SIFTON: Well, giving more satisfaction to the public.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I may point out you may get into the hands of the devil you do not know, as against the devil you know now, and as a consequence the regulations might be stiffer under another board.

MR. SIFTON: It is possible, that could be said about any system which we try to improve on, it is a universal answer, it may be worse but in our view that is not the result and we urge our judgment, with respect, on the Commission. Incidentally, it goes a little further than that, we are suggesting that it would be appropriate for a new body, not being interested in broadcasting themselves, to constantly consider how much and how little regulation would be in the public interest, and we respectfully urge that the tendency will be, we will urge that the tendency should be in our opinion that there would be less regulation of content.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Had you any thought when you made this suggestion, Mr. Sifton, as to the body that would take over the regulating powers? The Board of Transport Commissioners has been mentioned on several occasions.

MR. SIFTON: With all due respect, I am speaking for myself and I think what was suggested in the brief of the Association was not that at all. It is understood perfectly well that transportation is a public utility, it is explained

in the brief, as I understand it, that broadcasting is publication, it is part of the press, it is not a public utility and in that regard there is no similarity between the kind of regulation which should be applied to public utility and the kind of regulation that should be applied to the press. We believe on the pure consideration you will come to the realization that broadcasting is part of the press, and for all the historic reasons and all the services it gives it ought to be in the public interest, it ought to be similarly dealt with.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I do not know that I would entirely agree with you that it is part of the press, because to say that is almost tantamount to saying that the entertainment on radio and television is incidental to the distribution of news. I do not know whether I can go with you on that.

MR. SIFTON: I would most respectfully say that this is a business I have been in a long time, I have paid a lot of attention to it and given a lot of consideration, and with respect, after thinking of it, I am hoping you come to the same conclusion. I am reinforced in this by the fact that Mr. Dunton addressed the convocation of the University of Saskatchewan and chose communications as his subject and explained to the students that this was part of the press, etcetera, and all part of the same thing. He is a very distinguished authority on the matter.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Communication but

publication.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it not really oversimplifying to tie everything to the claim that this is part of the press? Surely there are certain elements on radio and television broadcasting that are analogous to the publication of the newspaper, there may even be certain elements that are analogous to the publication of a magazine, there are certainly elements that are analogous to the running of a movie theatre, there are certain things analogous to the educating process and schools and the like. It is a much more complex thing than just saying this is part of the press and, therefore, all the rules of the press apply because the test came when we asked the Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters whose brief you endorse whether or not they accepted the principle that there should be some regulation of programme content and they said yes, they did. Now, I cannot conceive of my friends in the newspaper publishing business making that answer.

MR. SIFTON: May I comment on this?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. SIFTON: To start with, what we endorse is what is printed in the brief, there was some discussion that took place at that time which I did not hear and certainly I do not take in any blank way because I would not know what I was endorsing. What is written in the brief I think is sound and right and I endorse it and urge it. You refer to this being an over-simplification, it was

not my suggestion that it was simple, my suggestion is that the press is a very many sided thing and far from simple and probably has little interest or perhaps less interest than any other important factor or feature of democratic life in Canada at the moment. I suggest that there is no element, not one, that does not appear in broadcasting and does not appear in the daily newspapers. There is certainly a difference in degree or emphasis or importance, if you like, but I suggest again in all its essential factors it is the press and on mature consideration I urge upon you, and a careful consideration of the whole subject of the difficult business of what the press is, what its functions are in the public interest, that you may come to the same conclusion. For instance, you ask about entertainment; what would twenty-four pages of comics be, what would thirty pages of comics be, a magazine section in a newspaper be, travel stories in newspapers, there is a substantial element, the weekly paper has a different make-up from a daily paper or a magazine or a pamphlet but they are all the press, and in the very important public matter of information about public affairs, knowledge of the people in public life the radio and television are much more revealing, have more facets in allowing the people to understand their public leaders, what they stand for, what the government is doing, etcetera, etcetera.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask you a question there? Supposing it was thought at some time

that it would be a desirable rule by the state to limit the violence and character of the comic strips in the newspapers, would you think that regulation was any curtailment of the freedom of the press?

MR. SIFTON: It would all depend on how it was done. You see, originally the printed press was subject to licensing, arbitrary licensing exactly as the present broadcasting. It is curious and interesting, it came into the Star Chamber at one point, it is neither here nor there, but it is an interesting fact it was subject to arbitrary discretionary control by the government. There was a contest between the public and their right to be informed and the established principles of Parliament which originally was not democratic in the sense that we know it. Originally Parliament was a group who established their right against the public as evidenced by the fact that the public was not allowed in and no one was allowed to report what went on in Parliament, and there was a growing desire on the part of the people to know more. Two publishers turned up who felt they could make a business of servicing this desire and they went and did it. This went on for a hundred years and they battled one way and the other, they arrested writers and publishers, they put them in jail in Westminster and finally wound up with a battle between the City of London that was a Guild City who felt responsibility for their employees and Westminster, incidentally, was outside of the City of London and a great battle took place between the two, and

finally when Parliament sent the Sergeant-at-Arms to bring out some publishers for something he had written about the conduct of Parliament, the City of London put him in jail, he was promptly bailed out and the whole matter came up before Parliament and the people went out to Westminster on two or three occasions and the Prime Minister could hardly get inside himself, they upset his carriage and there was a great rumpus and Parliament decided they would not interfere with the right of publishers to publish what went on in Parliament, no law was passed but it has never been challenged since.

THE CHAIRMAN: To use your phrase, with great respect, I do not think you are answering my question. This is an interesting argument as to how the medium of Parliamentary report came out, but I am putting the question to you: you were saying that entertainment found its place in the daily newspaper and you quoted the comics, I am putting to you this question: If there was national or provincial state restrictions on the nature and content of the comic strips if, in your opinion, that would be a curtailment of the freedom of the press?

MR. SIFTON: With great respect, I am trying my best to answer this, but I think a certain background is necessary to answer it, and if I could have your indulgence I will try and answer it. What happened was, they discovered, first of all, a different way of regulating the press, they passed legislation that had to do with libel and

slander and this and that and the various kinds of functions to which the publication was prone, they passed these laws, they established them as the laws of the land and they were enforced by private persons and by public prosecutors in the courts of the land, and this they did as an acceptable substitute for censorship of the press, and this has been adopted by every democratic people since. Now, if they did it by censorship I do not think it would be acceptable to the press, and if they did it by prosecuting the people in the courts I think this would be in the public interest and desirable and acceptable all around.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Mr. Sifton, since you annex broadcasting to publishing, must we form the conclusion that in broadcasting as in publishing there must be no regulation whatsoever except subject to the public courts in a case of libel?

MR. SIFTON: Of content?

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Yes?

MR. SIFTON: That is my position, yes, sir. I might give you another reference that might be of some interest. The Chairman mentions the question of the theatre and there is a case, the reference to which I will have to send you, it is an United States case, I realize the feeling that seems to arise when ever any mention is made of the United States and I hesitate to put it forward but it is most illuminating, as we would say in law, persuasive but not binding. In the United States they have by constitutional amendment what

we would call a Bill of Rights, they have rights guaranteeing the freedom of the press. There is a case in the last three years with regard to moving pictures and their censorship and licensing and everything that goes with it, and every last thing that has been said about broadcasting of pictures was dealt with, I believe, in this; and it was found by the Supreme Court of the United States that it was a part of the press, that it came clearly within the guarantees of the freedom of the press.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe Mr. Allard gave us that in Ottawa, that reference.

MR. SIFTON: I suggest this entire subject was discussed and very greatly illuminated, they did not only give a judgment, they discussed it at great length, and I suggest you will find it illuminating.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to be clear that your answer to Commissioner Turcotte is what I think it is; you believe there should not be any public regulation of the content of radio and television programmes?

MR. SIFTON: I would not be happy with the wording, but if we mean the same thing I would agree, I think; in other words, there should not be censorship of the broadcast publication.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us not get onto these nasty words.

MR. SIFTON: I am trying to get away from it, I think the press is regulated, what I --

I do not want regulation in that sense to be confused and it is very greatly confused in the mind of the public.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me put it to you, we are leaving aside the regulation that arises through general statutory rules or common law rules such as statutory prohibition against insanity, laws which cover libel and slander and the like.

MR. SIFTON: Can I add to the list any other new ones which appear to be in the public interest?

THE CHAIRMAN: But again done by way of legislation, in other words, its enactment by the duly constituted measure of the law but apart from these laws as to the conduct of people engaged in this operation you would say there should then be no public regulation of the content of the radio and television programmes?

MR. SIFTON: I still would be happier to put it a little different. I am afraid this will be misunderstood, the preamble I accept, I would say that outside of that there should be no discretionary governmental control of the content.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let me get that.

MR. SIFTON: No discretionary government control of the content of what is published. Now, I must put this in: We are now broadcasting under the present regulations where there is full power, full discretionary power to exercise in any way they like to control what we broadcast; this is

the law of the land and we are scrupulously subject to this and adhere to it and do not try to avoid it, but as a citizen experienced in this field, this being a Royal Commission, you ask me what would be in the public interest, and I am giving you my opinion and trying to support it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is most valuable to us to have your view because we know you have given this a lot of thought.

MR. SIFTON: I do not want to be misunderstood in being a rebel, I am a rebel in disagreeing, but we live strictly within the regulations of the C.B.C. and the instructions we get we follow and I hope we are never accused of not abiding with the regulations; but as a private citizen I am expressing what I think would be an improvement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us get down to the question of control in broadcasting, let us take some examples; would you say that there could be regulation of the amount of time devoted to straight commercial advertising in an hour?

MR. SIFTON: Well, I think now you are getting into the question of what laws ought to be passed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am on another point, I am not asking for us to try and sit down and devise a way of regulation, but I am looking at some ideas of possible regulations with a view to seeing whether they are capable of being reduced into the over-all statutory type of regulation which you are

- 105 -

talking about, or whether they are in the nature of administrative or operating matters which perhaps could not be put into a statute.

MR. SIFTON: As to the capacity of the system of statutory law enforced in the courts, I think there is no reason whatever why any limitation as to advertising content could not be so enforced. As to whether it would be desirable to do that, of course, there would be many differences of opinion, and it would be a question for the Parliament of Canada to say what was in the public interest. Personally, my own view is that this is a very competitive business, I think it can be even more competitive on another branch, and we are suggesting that it would be desirable in the interest of Canada, not to the broadcaster but in the interest of Canada for the government to issue as many licenses for radio and television as they can find people ready and willing to use. We think this is the way people get served best, and we do not think the government should be concerned with whether we succeed financially or not. This is a publishing business and the people get served best by allowing anybody who has an idea he can serve them to go ahead and serve them. My own view, therefore, is, and what I would ask you for -- but I am quite sure it is not acceptable to the public at large now -- I would argue that the question of advertising content should be judged according to whether it is acceptable to the listeners or not. I think service to the public is first, last

and always. The theme of this whole field is having a perfect right to turn into any one of several stations or turn it off. If on the whole one station offends because in the view of the listener they do not like the advertisements, they can look at another station. It seems to me the whole thing should be left to competition, and if it is left to competition it will be in the public's interest. It should be as competitive as the government can make it, and there should be no concern about how much advertising it carries.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Do you not think there is a place in radio and television for the development of some cultural aspects for this country? I do not think it would be in the public interest to permit unlimited advertising to the exclusion of education and the development of a Canadian culture which I am afraid would go over the boards if that form of unlimited advertising is permitted.

MR. SIFTON: May I give an answer to this? I am afraid this will not be in one word because it would be misleading in one word, but it will give you a different point of view. There are two points of view and one is that this medium should be adopted by the government for protection by a governmental body and the use of it for what they think is cultural. It is hardly to be supposed that everybody will agree with them, as witness the arguments that go on, and that Mr. Massey took this view. I refer you for a different view on culture

altogether and one which I think is worthy of your consideration. This is a little booklet called "Essays towards definition of culture" by T.S. Elliott. I find this very illuminating and it takes an entirely different, broader view. He is in favour of a great heterogeneous business and in favour of contact with outside cultures, and he argues that by keeping out other cultures you hurt your own culture. Now, I would point out there is no danger of commercial broadcasters disregarding culture, there is no danger, in my opinion; all you need do is to examine the operations both here and in the United States of a private enterprise operation. You may say whatever virtue there is in private enterprise broadcasting in Canada they have today because of the C.B.C. control. Well, I would respectfully challenge this, I think we are anxious to do it because we are citizens that like nice things and are anxious to be associated with a creditable enterprise and to do good things. Now, if you turn to the United States, as recently as this last few weeks I discovered the C.B.S. had a broadcast of the outstanding musicians of the world in a general broadcast to North America; I can remind you of a great number of these, the Carnegie Hall, the Metropolitan Opera, the various symphonic orchestras in the United States, none of them whom I think are state assisted or controlled or subsidized or anything of that kind. I suggest if you take a look at it you will find that culture

is present every day and it is run by private enterprises. You will find the fact is that it depends on the character of the people and I think that is true here and I think there is a good deal of unnecessary anxiety on that score and I think that an impartial look at it will prove this. It is true there is a lot of bad broadcasting in the United States and a lot of bad publishing in Canada but it goes on, and to think you are going to have more culture by more restriction, in my opinion, is not well founded.

THE CHAIRMAN: We seem to have got away from Mr. Coyne.

MR. SIFTON: I am sorry, I had hoped you would not question me on these views of mine.

THE CHAIRMAN: We want to know what is in your mind.

MR. SIFTON: These ideas are not popular and perhaps offensive, and if we can put this to one side we would be ready for any questions and we shall try to answer them.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: For our purpose we want as many diverse views as possible, we have to make some recommendations and we cannot do that unless we know what the people are thinking.

MR. SIFTON: I hope I may be forgiven in certain quarters for telling what I was thinking.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we come back to Mr. Coyne, you are a very knowledgeable person about the state of public opinion in Canada, having

been devoting most of your life to it, would it be fair to say from that knowledge the thesis that you are putting forward would perhaps not get general acceptance throughout?

MR. SIFTON: No, with the utmost respect, I think it would, I think that if this case were properly argued, if these facts were generally known ---

THE CHAIRMAN: No one has ever accused you of not arguing properly and I know you have been arguing on this front for some time.

MR. SIFTON: Not before the public generally.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is, we are a Royal Commission that must seek to bring in the best regulations that we can, but we ought also to have a certain amount of public approval behind it in order to do a practical job, and I am struck by the fact that the whole long history back to 1928 and the investigations into this subject we have been debating, not only through Royal Commissions but through Parliamentary Committee after Parliamentary Committee has in fact reflected the opposite point of view to the one you have been putting.

MR. SIFTON: With all due respect, I think this is all subject to a certain qualification; it is true the reports may have been this way, it is true also that the reports have been made by Parliamentary Committees that have been under the control of the government in power, it is true that this is a most desirable system from the point of

view of the government which gives them absolute control over a large part of the field to operate this field in the time of elections, etcetera and etcetera, and I cannot imagine any government willingly surrendering this power.

THE CHAIRMAN: These Parliamentary reports were approved by the Opposition, too.

MR. SIFTON: Well, this again is subject to some qualification.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stewart was saying that after all the Parliamentary Committee should be a reflection of public opinion.

MR. SIFTON: Of course, it may be, but there is another comment I would put on that. It is a curious custom of reporting the Parliamentary Committee to the House of Commons on the last day of the Session.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the only thing that comes up on the last day.

MR. SIFTON: No, but I would be happy if you would put that in with the other things that come up on the last day.

MR. COYNE: Maybe I should direct these questions to Mr. Speers but, in any event, you may correct me if I am wrong. Mr. Speers, I understand that C.K.R.C. is a basic station in the Dominion network, is that right?

MR. SPEERS: Yes, that is right.

MR. COYNE: Would you tell me what it means, what being a basic station in the Dominion

network means, what obligations does it impose on you with regard to programming and what rights have you got to call on the C.B.C. on matters of that kind? Could you explain that for us briefly?

MR. SPEERS: Yes, I think I can. Basically, by becoming a basic station of the C.B.C. you are required to carry certain specific programmes at times which may be disseminated by the C.B.C. and, in exchange for these, or, perhaps as a part of the same arrangement, any commercial programmes, the programmes I was referring to earlier are sustaining programmes for which we receive no money; in addition to that, any commercial programmes which are on the Dominion network are available to you and you are required to carry them.

THE CHAIRMAN: You receive no money and you pay no money for the sustaining programme?

MR. SPEERS: That is right.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Straighten me out on this: When you are talking of the Dominion network, that is the Dominion network, that is not the Trans-Canada?

MR. SPEERS: No, this is the second network.

MR. COYNE: Well, in addition I think you said you were bound to carry certain sustaining programmes and also bound to carry certain other programmes within the reserve time?

MR. SPEERS: Yes, the reserve time only includes sustaining programmes, the philosophy, I

guess you would call it, in the operation of the network is going to be able to sell time it must be reasonably sure that the time is available to sell, so while there is no written agreement there is at least a moral obligation to do your best to clear for commercial programmes if you are going to be a basic station on the network.

THE CHAIRMAN: How much of your total broadcasting time is taken up in any given week by the programmes that you get either sustaining or of commercial nature from the C.B.C.?

MR. SPEERS: At this minute it would amount to 9 hours perhaps.

THE CHAIRMAN: Out of how many total broadcasting hours?

MR. SPEERS: How much is 18 times 7?

MR. COYNE: Well, Mr. Speers, how do you become an affiliate of the Dominion network? You said something a minute ago about there being no written agreement, it is a moral obligation, what are the mechanics of becoming an affiliate of the C.B.C. network? It strikes me that it must be by agreement or regulation of some kind.

MR. SPEERS: Well, certainly it could be by regulation under the existing regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, is it in your license?

MR. SPEERS: It is in the C.B.C. regulations that we must carry as many programmes as C.B.C. may disseminate through as it is possible to do --

it is done by agreement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we have some stations that are in the Dominion network and some that are not.

MR. KEDDY: The stations apply to the Board of Governors, the application comes to the Board of Governors requesting a connection with the network. The Board first looks at the network servicing area and if it grants it it puts the network laws to the station, it says that if they are going to join the network they have to join under the terms that they will provide programmes at no cost to you and you will carry them and we would give you commercial programmes if you are basic, and if you are sustaining you could be added for supporting shows and you will have available to you available existing programmes at no cost to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The basic point seems to be that the way to become a member of the Dominion network is for you to apply to get in.

MR. SPEERS: I am not sure that is true in all cases; it seems to me it is possible in all cases where the Dominion network was not being heard that the C.B.C. extend sort of an invitation, they encourage an application by indicating it would be accepted. For the record I think Mr. Keddy is probably right, the basic situation ---

THE CHAIRMAN: In your own case you did apply?

MR. SPEERS: I am not sure because I

was not at this broadcasting station at the time, but I assume that we would.

THE CHAIRMAN: At that time it was quite an advantage to be on the network, is it still?

MR. SPEERS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you applied to get out of the network?

MR. SPEERS: No, sir, I do not think we should take it when it is in our favour and when it is not, turn it down; it is not fair.

MR. COYNE: Is there anything that prevents you from cancelling your affiliation?

MR. SPEERS: Aside from moral obligations there is a regulation that can prevent us.

MR. COYNE: Could prevent you from doing it because the regulation applies to all stations, does it not? I mean, all stations, according to the regulations, have to carry programmes if the C.B.C. requires to do it?

MR. SPEERS: That is right, all stations or any station.

MR. COYNE: Not only network affiliates but anybody?

MR. SPEERS: That is right, but it applies equally to me as to any other broadcasting station.

THE CHAIRMAN: You see, we asked in Ottawa the Private Broadcasting Association if they wished to remain part of the national broadcasting system, and they answered yes quite unequivocally

that they would like to remain. I would like to ask the same question of you: Do you want to remain part of the broadcasting system or not?

MR. SPEERS: My answer would be in this way: If, in the opinion of the national broadcasting system, they felt it would be advantageous for them, for me to be an affiliate, I am quite prepared to give them that co-operation, but as to it having any financial or audience or any other meaning for me, no.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You say it is no longer to your advantage; why?

MR. SPEERS: Because it contains a great many programmes directed to minority audiences at times of the day which make it impossible for me to do the local things which would be of most advantage to me.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: In the way of finance?

MR. SPEERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is probably disadvantageous to you because it is occupying the time which you could sell commercially?

MR. SPEERS: And with it I can attract more audiences.

THE CHAIRMAN: For commercial sale?

MR. SPEERS: Yes.

MR. SIFTON: I wonder if I could add a word? We are, of course, a commercial station, I would like to make it clear that we do not think

there is anything the matter with being in the business, we have no other way, we are not subsidized, nothing of that kind; we are in a commercial business. Every time an ad is mentioned or a commercial policy is mentioned it seems to be kind of a dirty word, but we think there is nothing the matter with doing business. We would dissent from any idea that there is nothing that is not in the public interest, we think it is in the public interest to do anything to encourage business in Winnipeg.

MR. COYNE: Are you familiar at all with the United States network arrangements?

MR. SPEERS: By hearsay only, I have never read a United States network contract.

MR. COYNE: Would you care to say whether or not in your opinion there is anything fundamentally different with regard to the rights and obligations of stations with regard to networks, the arrangements between them, that there is anything fundamentally different between the C.B.C. network and the network in the United States?

MR. SPEERS: I really would not, I have never seen a C.B.C. contract nor an American network contract and I do not know.

MR. COYNE: Turning to your brief where you are describing or summarizing the development of your station, you point out that your full-time staff now numbers 50 people?

MR. SPEERS: Yes.

MR. COYNE: I don't think we know very

much about who works at radio stations: what are the categories of employment? Are they technical men or announcers? Could you give us very briefly what the 50 people do?

MR. SPEERS: I will have to do it from memory.

MR. COYNE: I am asking you for a very general picture.

MR. SPEERS: Five or six of them are in the news department engaged in the gathering and broadcasting of news. Six or seven of them are writers. Another half-dozen are announcers. Perhaps eight or nine are engineers -- ten, I believe. The others are department heads -- the heads of each of these departments. There are two people in the department for looking after public service.

MR. COYNE: You mentioned writers: what sort of work are your writers engaged in?

MR. SPEERS: They are people of some imagination rather than -- I don't expect any of them will ever write the Great American Novel although they may fool me. They are people of imagination whose business it is to dream up ideas for programmes and commercial purposes and to get them on paper in such fashion as we can use them.

MR. COYNE: Could you tell us very roughly, apart from your network programmes, what proportion of your programming is sustaining as distinct from -- what I have in mind, really, is, what proportion is free in the sense of no charge being

made for time?

MR. SPEERS: I think I can give you not an up-to-date answer, but a fairly representative answer on that because we are required to analyse this each year under the terms of our license for the C.B.C. For a sample week in 1956 -- and these figures will be available to you -- 17 hours and 10 minutes of local live commercial; 14 hours and 40 minutes of local live sustaining; recorded hours were 18 hours commercial, 68 hours and 45 minutes of sustaining.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is, recorded sustaining?

MR. SPEERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes?

MR. SPEERS: Our network hours during that week were 3 hours and 20 minutes commercial, and 6 hours and 30 minutes sustaining programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What was the sustaining again?

MR. SPEERS: 6 hours and 40 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Network sustaining?

MR. SPEERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That gives you your 9 or 10 hours which you mentioned before?

MR. SPEERS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Mr. Speers, could you by any chance tell us the average number of hours per month that you would give to community service and the value of that to you had you held it off for commercial purposes?

MR. SPEERS: I don't think I could do it for an average month, but I did, when I was preparing this, run off a figure, and it may seem I am being a little over-proud in mentioning it, but the cost of the time alone involved, without staff or out-of-pocket expenses or production costs ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Really what it could have sold for?

MR. SPEERS: No, just the cost of the time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see.

MR. SPEERS: We would have charged for the work on it. It was \$40,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have 18 hours of recorded commercials and you have 68 hours and 45 minutes of recorded sustaining?

MR. SPEERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I assume that that distribution between those two items is based upon the amount of commercial advertising that is offering for this type of recorded programme? In other words, if you could sell 50 hours of recorded commercial you would do so?

MR. SPEERS: I can see no objection to selling 100%.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but with this distribution of approximately 69 hours recorded sustaining, you have that amount because you have not been able to sell it for recorded commercials?

MR. SPEERS: Exactly, sir.

MR. COYNE: Just on that point, supposing

you have a situation where you are running recorded music and you are not selling the time to anybody but you are interspersing your recorded music with spot advertisements that you charge for; within these figures how do you classify that -- would that be sustaining?

MR. SPEERS: Yes, it is classified as sustaining amongst those figures. The number of announcements is also included in that report we send to the C.B.C. -- the number broadcast during the sustaining periods.

THE CHAIRMAN: Spot announcements?

MR. SPEERS: What we call flash announcements, which are very brief mentions.

MR. COYNE: So, from the point of view of the listener, whether a programme is sponsored with appropriate commercial announcements in the middle of it or whether it is not sponsored but there are spot announcements interspersed, you probably agree that the average listener is not very conscious of that distinction?

MR. SPEERS: That could conceivably be so in certain periods of the day, although let me emphasize we work very hard to make them conscious of the fact that a certain period is sponsored when it is.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Speers, this is a final question: You are in the radio business and one of the points of the C.A.R.T.B. brief, which you endorse, is advocacy of the licensing of competitive tele-

vision stations: Could you give us your views as to what effect you think television is having or is going to have upon radio?

MR. SPEERS: Yes, I have many views on this. It has, to begin with, reduced the glamour of radio to the point where radio has now become a service rather than a show place. To that extent I think it has changed methods considerably in the broadcasting field. There is little doubt it has had some effect on the revenues of broadcasting stations up to this point. Whether that remains permanent or not is a question. In some areas of the United States they tell me it has not remained permanent.

Fundamentally, I think radio has another competitor, but it had seven or eight before and I think it will survive and probably be the better for it.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, it has a continuing function to perform, you believe?

MR. SPEERS: Oh, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one or two questions to ask. I think it is the third page of your brief where you say, "It is for this reason that our schedule includes a wide diversity of programmes ranging from cooking lessons to symphony concerts, dramatic programmes, popular music ...", and so on.

MR. SPEERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Leaving aside anything you get from your Dominion network service, what portion of live symphonic concerts do you put on?

MR. SPEERS: None at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: None at all?

MR. SPEERS: May I say, though, that I don't think you can leave aside what you get from the Dominion network, because that is coming over your transmitter to your listeners.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, I am not questioning this: I am trying to get at the facts. I take it you do put on recorded symphony concerts in the sustaining periods of your 68 hours and 45 minutes?

MR. SPEERS: Some, but not a great many.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am trying to find out what your brief means. You mention dramatic programmes?

MR. SPEERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What kind of thing are those?

MR. SPEERS: In many cases from the network; in some cases from transcription, and in a small number of cases locally produced by amateurs.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you do some local programmes of that kind, but relatively infrequently, I would take it?

MR. SPEERS: That is true, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Going to this 17 hours 10 minutes of local live commercial and 14 hours and 40 minutes of local live sustaining, what kind of thing would those programmes be?

MR. SPEERS: That category would include, if I remember correctly -- perhaps I should check this. Perhaps if I were to give you some examples: It includes a programme with an actor and a sound

man who, with some imagination, produces a programme for children, and another one of much the same type which includes a popular orchestra with guest talent each week, and it also includes in that total such things as broadcasts of an educational or informative character; discussions on public affairs, news broadcasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you as a station get together panel discussions from time to time?

MR. SPEERS: Perhaps not exactly in the form of a panel discussion, but we do try our very best to get subjects of interest before the listening audience, yes.

Mr. Sifton was worried that you didn't understand that local questions did get discussed on the air. I thought you did understand that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but in what way through your efforts as a station do they get discussed?

MR. SPEERS: Through talks, interviews and things like that.

THE CHAIRMAN: What about news? Is your news sponsored?

MR. SPEERS: Some of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: And when you have a sponsored news item, where do you put it in these categories?

MR. SPEERS: It breaks down under "local live commercial".

THE CHAIRMAN: So to the extent your newscasts are sponsored, that would come under "local

live commercial"?

MR. SPEERS: That is so.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Local news, mostly, do you mean? Or national and international? How are they gathered -- C.P. or through your own newspaper?

MR. SPEERS: No, we have no connection with the newspaper. We have a news staff of six people which has available in its newsroom the services of the broadcast news wire which is the radio wire and British United Press wire, and we also subscribe in our own newsroom to the Canadian Press newspaper wire. We get it from that and from local news we gather by news reporters who have available to them mobile equipment to report back to the studios -- mobile transmitting equipment. I would like to show it to you some time.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You cover a certain spot, and by remote control you get it?

MR. SPEERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You endorse the C.A.R.T.B. brief which asks for immediate licensing of non-government television broadcasting stations in all areas of Canada: I take it, as a station, C.K.R.C. has no direct interest in that idea?

MR. SPEERS: That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a matter of principle you are putting forward.

I have one other question, Mr. Sifton, which I somewhat hesitate to ask but on which you

may be able to give us some help. It is a point that has been put to us and we are probably going to have to consider it, and any help we can get we will be grateful for, and that is this argument we have got from several quarters that there is a public danger in having what is termed variously a monopoly of the public information media, and that there should be either some prohibition or some obstacle placed against the operation of radio and television stations by newspaper publishers.

MR. SIFTON: This is a very fair question. I don't know whether this is the place to answer it but if you prefer it, all right. I believe I have been cited personally as the owner of a newspaper and radio and television station.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a problem that we both know has been preoccupying the American thinking for some time, and apparently it is beginning to creep into Canadian thinking.

MR. SIFTON: I would be happy to give you a written memorandum, or to discuss it. It is somewhat like saying, have you stopped beating your wife yet?

THE CHAIRMAN: I should interrupt you to say this; give us a brief statement now, and if you wish to put in a memorandum on the subject I would be glad to have it.

MR. SIFTON: I would be most happy to put it in. The brief statement is this, that there are two factors which are involved. One is the

service to the public -- in fact, the over-all is the service to the public, not some imaginary thing about this or that. The question is, how is the public best served, and I suggest that the answer is different in every situation, or may be different, or may have elements of difference in every one. I suggest that is first and last and always the criterion on which any situation must be judged -- how well you serve the public by doing anything to restrict the service or embarrass anybody that deals with you. I suggest that latter smacks of monopoly in its classical form. It applies to manufacturing, importing, exporting, merchandising and every other kind of field, indeed, the professional field, and a monopoly with its classical restrictions which tends to arise in those circumstances is not in the public interest.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt you: You were putting, as I took it, the test of how in fact it is working in the public interest.

MR. SIFTON: No, I am suggesting that the criterion as to whether it is good, bad or indifferent is a question of how it serves the public.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but do you admit also, as it has been put to us, the theory of potential danger -- in other words, if you have a situation which even though it does not hurt the public, yet may some day hurt the public?

MR. SIFTON: With all due respect, I think it is a thing -- if it is a potential danger

it ought to be watched. I think you do a disservice to the public by interfering with an excellent or good service they are receiving unless you have a chance of improving it, and if the vice does not exist, I think it is unjust and not in the public interest to interfere with it. I suggest that monopoly in the mass communication field is just like, in principle, a monopoly in any other; the same factors come in. I think that any time when there is a suspicion that the service to the public is suffering because of ownership that it is a proper thing to investigate. I think that the Government of Canada has a department skilled and competent to examine these things, and I see no reason why mass communication should not be within the purview of their constant review and watching.

THE CHAIRMAN: Except that they do not accept the principle of "if the vice does not exist you should not interfere with it".

MR. SIFTON: With all due respect, I think they do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we could debate that for a long time.

MR. SIFTON: Of course, in each particular case -- would you like me to explain the Regina situation here?

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think you need to go into it, Mr. Sifton. This is a problem that has been put to us, and we may have to say something about it.

MR. SIFTON: There are two hooks, I think: one is, how is the public being served; and the other thing is, if they are not being served because of a monopolistic abuse I think it should be dealt with in the classical way that monopolies have been found to be able to be controlled in all fields.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: When you give us a study of this thing I would be most interested if you kept in mind the fact that has been suggested on different occasions to us, that the press and television, being means of communication, are means of influencing public opinion and as a consequence they are much more dangerous as a monopoly than, probably, something else.

MR. SIFTON: I will keep that in mind. The preliminary thought on that is the question of having it in the hands of the government, because this is the service by which the people are informed about public matters, and that information is necessary to the intelligent use of the vote -- clarity, and the desirability of having complete power in the hands of the person whose record is going to come up at each election.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, any of these comments you can give us we will appreciate. Thank you for your brief; it has been a very interesting discussion.

---A short recess.

-1879-

SUBMISSION OF THE RETAIL MERCHANTS'
ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

APPEARANCES:

Mr. C.I. Keith, Q.C.

Mr. D.A. Gilbert.

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next submission is from the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada. This is a national association, is it?

MR. KEITH: That is right, Mr. Fowler.

THE CHAIRMAN: And it is being presented by Mr. C.I. Keith, Q.C., and you have Mr. Gilbert, the President, and Mr. Wocks, the Secretary, also.

MR. KEITH: Just the President. I think our Secretary is otherwise engaged today. Mr. Gilbert is here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your brief will be No. 44, and I take it this is a national organization?

MR. KEITH: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

EXHIBIT NO. 44: Brief of the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed, then, Mr. Keith; you know our procedure here.

MR. KEITH: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Retail Merchants' Association is an association of 40,000 independent retailers located throughout Canada. It is a non-profit organization with the object of fostering and improving trade practices in the retail field, and encouraging and supporting worthy undertakings aimed at bettering

economic conditions and improving the Canadian standard of living.

Its members, because of their close association and contact with the general public, are in an excellent position to evaluate and report on current trends, conditions and public opinion in general.

The members of the Association at this time report a definite and overwhelming demand for the establishment of additional television outlets.

I am sure that you will hear this same report from many other sources, since it is too apparent to be missed by anyone discussing television in Canada today.

However, the Retail Merchants' Association would like to present its views to the Commission on this important subject.

There is no doubt that the television industry in many provinces is at a standstill at the present time. There is a definite lack of development due to a lack of outlets. Many people, who are prepared to purchase two or more sets, will not do so unless and until there is a choice of programmes offered to them. With only one programme on the air additional sets are unnecessary and useless.

Unfortunately many persons who do not own television sets, adopt this same attitude. They refuse to purchase even one set while the present single programme is being offered. Some do this on the alleged ground that they do not care for the fare which is being offered, or at least they do

not care to look at the programmes offered during the hours which they are able to devote to listening and watching.

Others refuse to buy a set on the ground that by so doing they are registering a protest against the C.B.C.'s monopoly of the air. In this way, so they argue, they are registering their disapproval of the present monopoly.

Whatever reasons are advanced or exist, there is no doubt that the market for television sets has not developed to anything like its proper or possible extent.

From an economic point of view additional stations would release much new wealth. It is the opinion of the Retail Merchants' Association that new stations would bring about a general increase in economic activity in many ways. Not only in the construction field would labour benefit from the erection of transmitters and studios, but the permanent staff required by each new station would increase the number of wage earners by a very considerable extent, to say nothing of the increased work and income for musicians, singers, actors, dancers, lecturers, sports participants, advertising salesmen and the countless other persons who would be involved in the regular daily production of television programmes.

The increased manpower involved in the manufacture, distribution and servicing of television sets would also be a factor in further

increasing employment and putting hundreds of thousands of dollars into circulation.

It is the view of the Retail Merchants' Association that this vast economic potential is at the present immobilized by government policy. While this may not be so in all Canadian centres, many of which are situated close to the United States where other programmes originate which are available to Canadian viewers, it is certainly the case in many centres, as for example here in Manitoba.

The independent Retail Merchant is exactly what his name implies. He is an individualist, convinced that individual initiative and free competition create the best atmosphere for progress, and produce the highest levels of economic and cultural achievement.

When government restrictions, monopolies and regulations govern an industry it is always at the expense initiative. So much effort is spent with propaganda trying to convince the man on the street that he is well off, little time or energy is left for breaking new ground, introducing improvements or experimenting with new techniques. In short, the retail merchant believes that there is no real substitute for competition and that the present lack of it in the television field is a definite handicap to the entire industry.

As individuals, the merchants also consider, in agreement with their customers, that no one group, be it government or private, should have

the exclusive right to say what is to be seen and how it is to be seen or heard.

Tastes differ and circumstances vary. These are the things that make life interesting and worthwhile. Anything which curtails and cramps these human needs and preferences is annoying at its best; dangerous and harmful at its worst.

There are adequate laws governing libel and slander, indecent and criminal activities. We, as a people, are sufficiently well governed and regulated without being subjected to the unwelcome regulations of the C.B.C. monopoly.

Perhaps this statement is unfair to the C.B.C., as that body has done, and is doing, a very good job within the field assigned to it by the government.

The Retail Merchants' Association would not like this submission to be construed as a criticism of the programming and activities of the C.B.C. The fact that the C.B.C. has been given the monopoly of the air is not its fault. The work it has been doing should be continued and expanded. There is much work to be done in encouraging and fostering a truly Canadian culture on a broad national basis. The people of all provinces would like to see this work carried on and extended. They also appreciate the fact that it cannot be done effectively except on a national basis. They realize that the money necessary to support such a continuous and comprehensive programme must come

through Federal financing. Canadians are ready and willing to contribute their individual and proper share for this purpose.

The Retail Merchants' Association does not believe, however, that in order to carry on this programme it is necessary to give the C.B.C. a national monopoly of the air. Nor does this Association believe that national objectives or interest would suffer if private enterprise were allowed to enter the television field.

It is the view of the independent merchant that the C.B.C. would do a more efficient job, strive harder to fulfil its proper function, and contribute more to our national life if it were spurred on by competition from private stations. If its programmes were subjected to a comparison with other outlets and programmes, far from doing the C.B.C. an injury, it would be the best thing that could happen to it.

The Retail Merchants' Association realizes that a considerable portion of the terms of reference of this Commission relates to finances. But it seems to us that there is a more fundamental question to be settled before the answer to this problem is obtained.

What is the function of the C.B.C., and what are we trying to do with it, or through it? If we, the Canadian people, are simply trying to amuse ourselves, to provide entertainment-evenings of fun for ourselves and our families then there is no excuse for the C.B.C. at all. Private enterprise

could do this job far better and far cheaper. If this is our objective we should put an end to the C.B.C. right here and now.

The Retail Merchants' Association does not believe that this is the reason for the C.B.C.'s existence. Nor does it believe that the people of Canada would like it to continue its operations if this were its purpose.

We all realize that our country is large and that its various parts are separated, not only by vast distances but by climatic, geographic, economic and racial differences. To weld together these parts and to maintain a common bond, requires intelligent effort, sympathetic understanding, persistence and sacrifice on the part of all of us. It is not a task to be underrated or taken lightly. Nor will it be achieved at a small price. It is a task that is worthwhile and which should definitely be pursued with all the intelligence and resources at our command.

The C.B.C. should continue to be an important contributing factor to a vast effort which is sparked by the Federal Government. Once this primary point is acknowledged and accepted it is no more pertinent to ask in what way should we finance it than it is to ask in what way should we finance the Government Travel and Publicity Bureau, the National Art Gallery, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the National Research Council, the St. Lawrence Seaway Project, the Civil Service Commission, or any other national undertaking aimed for the good and

welfare of Canada.

None of these undertakings is asked to point out, earmark or collect revenue from special taxes on specific articles in order to continue its existence.

The C.B.C. must justify its existence as a worthwhile, national undertaking, worthy of support by all our people, or else it should be closed up. It should not have to justify its existence, or even any of its activities, by trying to scrape up the crumbs of excise taxes on radio and television sets.

In the opinion of the Retail Merchants' Association that earmarking, identifying and justifying special excise taxes on various electrical appliances and parts as a basis for a national radio and television network is ridiculous. These taxes are neither a reason nor excuse for a national network, nor is the C.B.C. a reason or an excuse for these unfair taxes. Yet each has been made a goat for the other.

These excise taxes were originally imposed as a special emergency measure to meet a threat to our way of life even to our national existence. The emergency which was the origin of these taxes passed away many years ago, but the taxes have lingered on. They are not being excused or justified today on proper, sound and economic grounds, but they are rather excused on the totally extraneous and irrelevant ground that they are needed to maintain the C.B.C.

It is a submission of the Retail Merchants' Association that these taxes are unfair and discriminatory under present conditions. They are an attempt to force the retail industry, or a portion of that industry, to finance a national system of broadcasting which is, or should be maintained by and for the benefit of all Canadians.

These taxes place upon the retailer of certain commodities a handicap and disadvantage in comparison with other lines of merchandising. They put upon the retailers' customers almost the entire cost of maintaining a vital national service.

Surely there can be no justification either on the basis of economics, or on the grounds of principle, for the continued existence of these excise taxes. The Retail Merchants' Association submits that the said excise taxes on radios and television sets and parts be removed, and that our national network be financed out of the general funds of the Federal Treasury, supervised and controlled, as at present, by a committee of Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything further to the brief?

MR. KEITH: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gilbert?

MR. GILBERT: No, I believe Mr. Keith has submitted our brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Keith, you refer in the early paragraphs of your brief to a widespread public demand for alternative programmes and the

desirability of a choice of programmes, and then you point out on page 2 that people refuse to purchase even one set while the present single programme is being offered. I rather get the impression that what you are saying is that if we had a second programme, automatically these disabilities would be removed and these people would purchase sets, and as though the second programme would necessarily satisfy everybody who didn't like the first programme. Could you tell us whether you have really given any consideration as to what the type of programme on the second station would likely be so as to have this result in increasing sales of television sets?

MR. KEITH: I don't think that the content of the programme is the point, Mr. Coyne. The fact is, as reported in this brief -- and it is a fact -- there are a large number of people who violently object to the present system of one station in one area and they refuse, I think foolishly because I bought a television set myself, but they definitely refuse to have any part of television until this system of a single station in one area is done away with, and I might add that is not an inconsiderable number of people.

The salesmen of the various outlets -- that is, the retail outlets -- report in their attempts to sell sets that they encounter this very often.

MR. COYNE: In other words, what you are

saying is that substantial sections of the public feel so strongly on this point of principle that they are prepared to deny themselves the benefit of any television?

MR. KEITH: Do you find that questionable? It is so.

MR. COYNE: Perhaps I am unduly sceptical of the extent to which people are prepared to deprive themselves on a point of principle.

MR. KEITH: I was at first, but in questioning a number of these retailers I find that they are not exaggerating it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Keith, Mr. Stewart suggests that what you are saying amounts to this, that a large portion of the people of Winnipeg are prepared to cut off their nose to spite their face?

MR. KEITH: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask you how many sets there are in Winnipeg?

MR. GILBERT: It is a very difficult question.

MR. KEITH: I imagine the C.B.C. would know.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many television homes are there in Winnipeg, Mr. Keddy?

MR. KEDDY: Approximately 85,000 to 90,000 sets in Manitoba.

THE CHAIRMAN: In Manitoba. Well, the great concentration of those would be in Winnipeg and its environments.

MR. KEDDY: I would think the majority of those sets would be in the Greater Winnipeg area.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the area served by television how many television homes are there? Have you any rough estimate of that?

MR. KEDDY: Mr. Findlay has informed me there is about 40% saturation in the Province as a whole, and I think we could calculate that to be 210,000 potential.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be covering the whole of the Province which is not now being reached?

MR. KEDDY: Not now being reached, and here in Winnipeg the saturation is about 60% of the potential. This is still an estimate; I haven't the latest figures on it.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Chairman, there were some figures in one of the briefs we had yesterday and it runs in my mind that they gave the number of households in the Greater Winnipeg area as 128,000 and the number of sets as 62,000. I am not sure as of what date those figures were given, but that would indicate about 50% saturation in the Winnipeg area.

MR. KEITH: I can only say -- and we didn't make a detailed study -- I think there is something less than 50% of the homes in this area that have television sets.

THE CHAIRMAN: How long has the television station been established here in Winnipeg?

MR. KEITH: I think they are finishing their second year.

MR. KEDDY: Two years ago, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: So in two years you have achieved 50%; that is not a bad average for a couple of years' effort?

MR. KEITH: I don't know; I have no comparison.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you are making the blunt statement that "the market for television sets has not developed to anything like its proper or possible extent"?

MR. KEITH: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: And "possible" is 100%?

MR. KEITH: Well, you must understand that the vast percentage of this 50% was achieved in the early days of the station, and that it has been slowing down very perceptibly and it is coming down to almost a halt lately. It rose very rapidly after the station opened, and then continued for a time and levelled off.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Keith, as a practical man in touch with business, wouldn't you expect that?

MR. KEITH: As a businessman, I can certainly appreciate the views of these merchants who see it happening and wish it had happened at a higher level than it has.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think the real point you are making is that it is somehow based on the fact that there is only one station.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think probably if the statistics could be had you would probably

find the exact opposite in Toronto where we got two Buffalo stations long before the C.B.C., and during that period in which only the Buffalo stations could be seen I think the television homes in Toronto was very low, but as soon as the C.B.C. came in I think it grew rapidly.

MR. KEITH: Again, I don't want to be taken as criticizing the C.B.C. or the programmes they are offering. I think they are very good, myself.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: We are merely trying to elicit information.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: We can make a rough calculation: there are 16 million Canadians and the present facilities of the T.V. network reach 80% of Canadians providing they have a set, and that is about 12 to 13 million. There are over 2 million sets in the country, which is one set for every six persons -- six and a half or seven. Of course, there are cases of individuals owning sets, but there are also families, the average family being four or five, and you are very near the saturation point except for cases of people who are not interested in T.V. in any event and a certain segment of the population cannot afford it in any event. So, would you say we are coming close to a saturation point?

MR. KEITH: You are not even beginning to get near a saturation point. Look at the radio picture: in my own house I have got five radios where twenty years ago you would have said that if I had one radio I was saturated. Many of my friends

would have two or three sets and be glad to have them, but there is no point in having them now.

MR. COYNE: Would you agree that the average price of radio sets being bought today is possibly in the vicinity of \$50, whereas the average price of television sets is possibly in the vicinity of \$300, and that that represents some distinction between the two markets?

MR. KEITH: I think it is always very dangerous to theorize about saturation points and how much money.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you were just theorizing about it.

MR. KEITH: No, I say we haven't nearly reached saturation point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if that is not theorizing, I don't know what is.

MR. KEITH: I am telling you what people have told me, Mr. Chairman, that they say it is not. You can believe it or not. The Retail Merchants believe we haven't nearly reached the point in sales of television sets, or anything like the point, where you would call it saturation.

MR. GILBERT: If I may interject, I believe it was generally understood that radio in Canada had reached saturation point almost two years ago. If I recall correctly the D.B.S. figures, the figures are released in that way, and yet radio sales have from time to time during the last year and a half showed increases over the year before and are still

doing big business. So, what is saturation? Two years ago we had reached saturation in the sales of radio sets, and we are still doing a nice business across Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Leaving aside the question of whether there is saturation or not, you are making the statement that the reason the sales are not going forward faster is the absence of second television broadcasting stations: How did you reach that view as a mechanical way of creating a brief? Did you conduct a questionnaire -- did you have a survey? Is this committee work, or is it just those who happened to write the brief giving their opinion?

MR. KEITH: No. Mr. Gilbert travels across Canada continuously and meets executives in each Province and discussed this matter. It was taken up with the National Executive of the Retail Merchants' and gone over by them, and I think it represents the views. I don't think you want to do it, but I wouldn't want the words put in my mouth that the only reason television sets are not being sold in the numbers they should be is because there is only one programme being offered; there are certainly other factors as well. I am saying this is one factor, but it is not the only factor.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is the only one you mention.

MR. KEITH: That is right, because it is the only one these merchants see, and through them we report to this Commission that there is a consider-

able dissatisfaction with the present system, and they hear it from the customers and possible customers, or potential customers. There are many other objections to television and programming and so forth, but we are not entering into that.

THE CHAIRMAN: But this particular reason that you are advancing is based upon Mr. Gilbert's personal contacts across Canada, and is not based upon any survey or inquiry or analysis of any formal sort which you make?

MR. GILBERT: I would like to make a correction to that. Mr. Keith has stated that I travel and meet with our provincial officers, which is a fact, and we go across Canada almost constantly, and we have provincial Boards of Directors, and we engage between 50 and 60 men in the field right across Canada whose job it is to contact retailers, discuss their problems and bring back to our Association the reactions in the merchandising field. That is where we gather our information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I wanted to know the technique.

MR. KEITH: I don't think there is any question that if additional outlets were open for them from the point of view of the additional interest incurred and the activity of people employed that it would stimulate the sales of more television sets. That is the point we wish to make. Frankly, that is all we are interested in. I don't think it is detrimental to the interests of Canada as a

whole, and we admit that we are interested in a practical way in this problem.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 4 of your brief you say, "When Government restrictions, monopolies and regulations govern an industry it is always at the expense initiative," and then down in the last paragraph on the same page you say, "We, as a people, are sufficiently well-governed and regulated without being subjected to the unwelcome regulations of the C.B.C. monopoly." I take that to be a criticism of the body which administers Government restrictions and regulations in this field?

MR. KEITH: No, because the next paragraph states definitely it is not. The thing we are objecting to is the Government policy and not the C.B.C. who are obliged to carry it out.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you say, "the unwelcome regulations of the C.B.C."; what regulations are unwelcome -- any regulations?

MR. KEITH: The fact that I cannot apply for a television station in Winnipeg at the present time is quite unwelcome to me and I don't think it is necessary. I think it serves no purpose.

MR. COYNE: Are you really drawing a distinction between the restriction which is now imposed by Government policy?

MR. KEITH: That is what I am criticizing.

MR. COYNE: Not by the C.B.C.?

MR. KEITH: No, it is unfair to call

them C.B.C. restrictions, it is really not their restrictions, they are carrying out Government policy and that is what we are objecting to.

MR. COYNE: This was a little unclear to me from reading the brief, but what you do not like is the Government policy?

MR. KEITH: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And you say on page 5 that the work the C.B.C. is doing should be continued and extended.

MR. KEITH: Quite.

MR. COYNE: So really your Association is drawing a distinction between the two factors?

MR. KEITH: Yes, absolutely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave page 4, there is a sentence I would like to have clarified, at the top:

"So much effort is spent with propaganda

"trying to convince the man on the

"street that he is well off -- "

Can you give me some examples of that?

MR. KEITH: Well, it is a continuous process, anyone that is in business is devoting time to explaining what they are doing and why they are doing it and what a good job they are doing, and the C.B.C. is doing the same thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: If it is a continuous process you ought to be able to give me one example of it.

MR. KEITH: The C.B.C. news, they put

out a publication, they hand it around.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a moment. The C.B.C. news, is this propaganda trying to convince the man on the street that he is well off?

MR. KEITH: I would think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would think so?

MR. KEITH: I would think so, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MR. COYNE: Just on the same page, Mr. Keith, about halfway down you say the merchants also consider that no one group be it Government or private should have the exclusive right to say what should be seen or heard or how it is to be seen or heard. I take it that your objection is to the one group having exclusive right, you do not carry the same objection to two groups sharing the exclusive right which, presumably, is the situation where you have two television stations?

MR. KEITH: Well, you are referring to the fact there are only so many channels available, is that it?

MR. COYNE: That is what I had in mind.

MR. KEITH: Well, that is a practical qualification but there are more than two channels available.

MR. COYNE: Well, say there are four, my only point was this: Suppose you and I are concerned whether there is one, two, three or four stations, somebody has rights that exclude us.

MR. KEITH: They are giving the right to

use that channel, you mean?

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. KEITH: Yes, but it is less objectionable to have two than one, and less objectionable to have three instead of two and less objectionable to have four instead of three.

THE CHAIRMAN: You say if you are a very poor man it is better if there is only one millionaire than if there were four?

MR. KEITH: Well, I do not know about that.

MR. COYNE: Turning on again to page 5 where you are referring to the work of the C.B.C. and saying that it should be continued and extended, and at the bottom of that paragraph you say:

"Canadians are ready and willing to contribute their individual and proper share for this purpose."

I wonder if you could indicate what the Merchants' Association feel is the individual and proper share which Canadians should contribute to this purpose?

MR. KEITH: Well, what that means is that they think that the upkeep of this system, this national system should be out of general funds of the Treasury of the country, the taxation that is levied by Canada is an attempt to collect from each citizen his fair share of taxes, and that is the basis of our tax structure; and if you take the money necessary to maintain this system, this national system, out of general revenues, everyone will have contributed in his fair share to that undertaking.

MR. COYNE: Have you any idea as to how much in taxes should be devoted to this purpose? It has been represented to us that television is like everything else, you get what you pay out, if you have \$50 million in taxes devoted to the purpose you get a certain level of service; if you have \$100 million you have perhaps twice the amount of service.

MR. KEITH: No, I would not like to go into that. I understand that the C.B.C. is under the direction and control of a committee of Parliament who supervises annually the operations of the Corporation over the past year and who approve the general plans and programmes for the coming year, and indicate to what extent the support of Parliament is given or withheld from the Corporation. I think in a practical way that is the only way it could be handled, you have a committee of people who are elected across Canada and who have a duty to go into these matters, their decision would have to stand; I do not see how it is possible for 15 million or 16 million Canadians to do it; they elect a group of people and trust that they are making the right decisions in these matters.

MR. COYNE: Of course, the suggestion has been made that the C.B.C. should not be financed on the basis of a mere annual grant which could go up and down.

MR. KEITH: I think that is right.

MR. COYNE: There should be a more or less orderly system.

MR. KEITH: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Your Organization would agree to that idea?

MR. KEITH: Definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I take it there is no view in your Organization of anything about a return to a license fee?

MR. KEITH: There is no expression of opinion on it, but my own view is, it is a very expensive way of getting a small amount of money actually.

THE CHAIRMAN: It used to be a small amount of money, it is quite a large amount now.

MR. KEITH: Well, the cost involved, that is quite extensive, it is unnecessary, people are paying taxes now.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 6 where you are dealing with the functions of the C.B.C. and you suggest that the provision of more entertainment would not be sufficient justification for the C.B.C., and you say that private enterprise can do this job far better and far cheaper. Now, have you made any studies or have you any specific facts or figures to support that statement? I will tell you the reason for my question: Certainly as far as Canadian-produced entertainment-evenings are concerned, those entertainment-evenings can only be produced if they are subsidized with public funds, and the implication, if that is correct, is that not only can private enterprise not do the job better and cheaper, but they could not do the job at all.

MR. KEITH: Well, if our television sets are only a source of entertainment, then I say we do not need the C.B.C. at all; wind it all up and let private enterprise into it because they will bring in programmes that will entertain people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bring them in?

MR. KEITH: Yes, bring them in, if it is only to entertain ourselves then let them come in.

MR. COYNE: Would you go so far as to say the C.B.C. should abandon the entertainment field altogether?

MR. KEITH: No, I would not.

MR. COYNE: Well, is that not really what you are suggesting here?

THE CHAIRMAN: You say as far as entertainment is concerned private enterprise can do the job far better and cheaper?

MR. KEITH: That is right. If the C.B.C. is not here for the purpose of building up a Canadian talent -- musical talent, dance talent, historical programmes, all the various forms that are included in the term culture, then I say if that is not their purpose, the basic purpose, then we do not need them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne's question was: Do you suggest that the C.B.C. should abandon their activities in the realm of pure entertainment? And I understood you to say no, that they should continue in the entertainment field?

MR. KEITH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And yet I find it diffi-

cult how you justify that when your brief says private enterprise can do the job far better and far cheaper.

MR. KEITH: Well, you slip over from the realm of education to entertainment when you develop performers and artists of sufficient calibre to entertain the viewers and the listener and the chief way in which people are encouraged to go into artistic lines of endeavour is the knowledge that their services, after they have reached a certain degree of proficiency and skill, will command an income sufficient for them to live on. I do not think, as I mentioned before, I do not think it is up to the C.B.C. to go out and participate in little theatre drives or amateur musical groups if they provide through their facilities and through their revenues a means whereby ^a first-class violinist can make a decent living and a good pianist can make a decent living or a top singer - that he or she will have sufficient income from the practice of their art; that in turn will encourage the young students taking that up as a life work and training themselves in the difficult mechanics of the arts, whereas, as has been in the past up until the C.B.C. came along, there was no incentive for young people to make the arts their life work because there was no way they could make their living at it in Canada, and I suggest the C.B.C.'s contribution to the field of culture by making a market for their services and giving encouragement would help young people to go into these things.

MR. COYNE: But you do not regard it

foremost as an entertainment?

MR. KEITH: No, not at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: On this point of entertainment, would I be right in taking from this sentence that private enterprise could do this job of entertaining far better and cheaper, to use your own words, they would do it by bringing it in?

MR. KEITH: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would, I think, undoubtedly be cheaper.

MR. KEITH: We would not need a national system at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are talking about entertainment as such and your proposal is: the way in which private enterprise would do the job, far better and far cheaper, would be by bringing programmes in?

MR. KEITH: I do not think there is any question about it, that is what would happen.

MR. COYNE: Just turning a little further on towards the end of the brief at the bottom of page 8 where you are referring to the excise tax, you say, starting at the bottom of the page:

"They are an attempt to force the retail
"industry, or a portion of that industry,
"to finance a national system of broad-
"casting -- "

Is that really a proper way to describe it? I mean, the retailer does not pay this tax, does he, the tax is assessed at the manufacturer's level and it is presumably passed on to and paid by the purchaser,

the consumer?

MR. KEITH: That is right.

MR. COYNE: You are not making any suggestion that the retail industry is paying this tax?

MR. KEITH: No, it is a tax on the sale price of the articles.

THE CHAIRMAN: And to the extent that it raises the price it may lower the sales?

MR. KEITH: That is right.

MR. COYNE: And the same could be said about the general sales tax?

MR. KEITH: Yes, but this is on top of that, this is an additional tax on top of that.

MR. COYNE: Oh, that is true.

MR. KEITH: But the sales tax is uniform throughout the whole trade, it is a pretty broad thing.

MR. COYNE: Provided out of the excise tax on radio and television?

MR. KEITH: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Keith, thank you very much for coming.

SUBMISSION OF THE MANITOBA LABOUR
PROGRESSIVE PARTY.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. W.C. Ross

Mr. R. Pennor

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is to be presented by the Labour Progressive Party by Mr. W.C. Ross and Mr. R. Pennor. The brief will be filed as Exhibit 45.

EXHIBIT NO. 45:

Brief filed by The Manitoba Labour Progressive Party.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have been sitting here, and as to the method of procedure we like the brief to be presented either by reading, if you prefer, or by summarization, if you can.

MR. PENNOR: I propose, Mr. Chairman, to just go over the brief highlighting the main points and amplifying them. At the outset, our brief takes note of the fact that very large and important sections of this community favour a second television channel, and at the same time want a retention and, in fact, a strengthening of C.B.C. control. For instance, the brief of the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture, the Labour brief which is forthcoming, which between them represents approximately 105,000 families which would, we think, represent close to better than half the population of the Province. We point this out because we believe that some of those who have been most active for a second television channel have

- 107 -

somewhat unfairly represented the public demand as being in fact a demand for private television, they have combined the two ideas which we would like to separate. The final brief that was heard yesterday, as a matter of fact, in no way differentiated, it said the public wants the second private television channel. We believe the public does want a second channel but we believe it is not correct to represent that demand as being a demand for private television or lessening of the control of the C.B.C. over broadcasting and televising. We ourselves support the idea of a second television channel for Winnipeg; we would look upon it as part of an extending C.B.C. in which perhaps priority would be given to these areas now without any coverage, and when these important sections of the community are given the consideration they deserve then the alternate choice in programming should be offered to metropolitan areas but under control of the C.B.C. In this respect that is as far as reaching out, particularly in a Province like Manitoba, to the rural areas, we suggest in our brief the possibility of a micro-wave set-up from Winnipeg to areas like Dauphin from where, as resources allowed it, could be extended further north.

Now, we are strongly in favour of public ownership of this second channel in one form or another for this reason, and I will quote from page 2 of our brief:

"We particularly want to endorse the

"thought that, above any other considera-

"tion, because of the very power of
"these instruments -- radio and television
"-- they must be so regulated and control-
"led as to serve Canadian national inter-
"ests: the use and development of
"Canadian talent, writing and Canada's
"cultural heritage, and that this end can
"only be guaranteed with continued public
"control where profit as an aim cannot
"submerge the public good. So that, in
"the words of A.D. Dunton 'Canada in tele-
"vision would not be just a nation of
"consumers of the products of others --'".

The commodity we are discussing is not soap or automobiles, but what is perhaps the greatest single influence on thinking today; and here, for the purpose of our presentation today, we are not quarrelling with the question of whether or not a profit is a factor in production is a correct motive or not. What we are saying is this: Once it becomes the primary service, as it must, if you are going into this or any other field for business, then it is a primary purpose and must of necessity override any other consideration. For this reason you would tend to get a deterioration of programming and cheapness would be the prime factor that would be considered. For instance, a well-known man with a good deal of experience in the field in New York recently said that T.V. is a medium which, in order to pay for it, you have to reach everybody, it is a merchandising medium and in order

to get clients you have to sell things. That is a blunt and forthright statement and it reflects the prime purpose and, therefore, anyone going into television today, a man who is cultured, respects culture, wants culture in his home, but he must sell goods and he must have that as his first consideration.

Now, we believe that once that becomes the aim you get tremendous pressure to use American canned material because of its cheapness. One factor in this is, that when a programme is produced in the United States and sold it has already paid for itself and it enters into the Canadian market almost as a dumped product in the sense that it is sold below its actual retail cost and therefore it competes with the Canadian product. Let us say you take a \$30,000 American show will sell on the Canadian market for much less than that and compete with a Canadian show that cost \$10,000 that cannot measure up to the States'. So the American programme does compete against us; therefore, you have a pressure for the importation, once profit is the motive, you have pressure for importation of a great deal of American programming, and it would tend to be more and more the cheaper type of programme. We want to make this quite clear, we are not opposing the use of American material, some of the good shows on television are American programmes and we are anxious that a situation is not created in which a floodtide of the cheaper type of canned material comes in and stops the development, the necessary and healthy development of

Canadian talent, culture and so on. What we do oppose is anything that would open the door to that type of development. We suggest that in Canada's public interest the second channel should be publicly-owned and operated.

In his Ottawa statement Mr. Dunton, the Chairman of the C.B.C., suggested three alternatives, and we would favour the idea of the C.B.C. running the second television programme entirely by itself. However, if that could not be undertaken, is not a practical point of view at this time, then we would not be adverse to the idea of the C.B.C. building the transmitter and providing basic Canadian programming for a part of the time to listen, some of the time, on that transmitter to a private group. However, we believe the long-range idea as a whole is complete public ownership of all radio and television. Our brief in saying that public ownership of a second T.V. channel is desirable expresses the belief that the record in radio, in private radio, is such that private ownership have not, in our opinion, justified themselves. We had some expression of that here, for instance, the Symphony gets almost its entire support from the C.B.C., and I would suggest that the Association of Canadian Radio Actors get close to 100% of their work locally through C.B.C. and nothing privately outside of the recording of a commercial. We heard something yesterday about some monitoring that was done by a group, we did some monitoring, we monitored a private station for a week, had a

group of people doing it, and they produced a list with something like 99.44/100% earned material, hit parade after hit parade, only lightened somewhat by give-away programmes, which seems to be the inducement to keep people listening to something they might otherwise turn off. One of our groups says it is just so little for the mind, it is nothing for the mind. This is an expression of opinion from a group that monitored one private station for a week.

Then, as to the basic question of support of local musicians and dramatic talent, these are things that can do so much to enrich our community life as a whole. We feel that private stations have not justified their demand to have authority placed in their hands.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the issue of public versus private ownership, I would like again to quote from our brief on page 3:

"In our opinion the argument that C.B.C.
"is both regulator and competitor is
"spurious. If it were not for the low-
"cost subsidized sustaining programmes
"and the advertising revenue com-
"mercial programmes distributed free
"by the C.B.C. to private as well as
"public stations, many private stations
"would not be able to exist."

We go on to use figures, some of them using 42 hours of C.B.C. programming per week, including over 13 hours of sustaining and over 29 of commercial.

What kind of competition is this? This is not competition but the co-operation it was intended to be. The C.B.C. has not violated its principle of not competing for local advertising with the private media.

Finally, in this presentation I want to read the entire final section:

"We do not contend that the C.B.C. or
"C.B.C. programming is beyond criticism.
"As great as has been the development of
"the past, there is a long way to go.
"The choice of children's programmes,
"for example, leaves much to be desired.
"We would like to see the elimination of
"such American violence programmes as
"Captain Gallant, The Lone Ranger and
"so on. But what is needed is construc-
"tive help and not wanton attack.

"We would propose the setting up
"of local advisory boards composed of
"representatives from labour, farm and
"business groups, Teacher and Parent
"Associations and cultural groups, with
"the sole function of advising on local
"programming with particular attention
"to the need of children and the fullest
"utilization of local talent and
"materials.

"We feel that in Winnipeg T.V.
"programming more use could be made of

-111-

"the rich and varied talent and tradition
"of the natural cultural groups, so much
"a part of the Canadian tradition as it
"developed here. We would like to see
" a local 'pick the stars' programme,
"more use of the local ballet groups, the
"development of a local T.V. drama pro-
"gramme. We would strongly urge the
"closest co-operation with the Manitoba
"Historical Society in bringing to T.V.
"here the great contributions to Manitoba
"of explorers, settlers and workers who
"built Manitoba. We propose the re-
"introduction of flat license fees by
"Parliament granting statutory grants to
"the C.B.C. to help it carry on, free
"from the pull of commercialism.

"To give impetus to greater use of
"Canadian material and personnel we would
"recommend consideration of taxing impor-
"ted canned material in somewhat the same
"way as the new tax on Canadian editions
"of American magazines. This would also
"increase revenues."

All of this is respectfully submitted by
our committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Pennor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything Mr. Ross?

MR. ROSS: Not at this time, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Pennor, turning to page 2 of your brief you say, "we support the demand for another T.V. channel for the Greater Winnipeg Area", and we have rather gathered the impression that the demand is for some immediate relief in this field. In the course of your presentation a moment ago you spoke of the trend and development of the national service and indicated some priority should be given those areas not yet covered. In terms of timing do you advocate the founding of a second T.V. channel in Winnipeg ahead of the extension of the service to areas not covered?

MR. PENNOR: No, I do not. I would think that once the principle of a T.V. channel was established and the public realized that they would be getting their second channel as soon as practicable, and that the reason they were not getting it immediately was in order, in all fairness, to allow sections that are not now serviced to get television, I think we are reasonable people here and that they would wait once they knew their demand was going to be satisfied within, let us say, a year and a half to two and a half years.

MR. COYNE: That is, you feel there should

-115-

be some announcement of a change of policy on the part of the government?

MR. PENNOR: Some indication that within a reasonable period of time it would be satisfied.

MR. ROSS: We look upon it as part of an expanding programme on the part of C.B.C. and we would like consideration to be given to it as part of a national plan taking into account the local needs and the opportunities it would offer for local talent.

MR. COYNE: What bears on this subject, as on everything else that has to do with T.V. is the question of cost; I understand that you have in mind that the second T.V. channel would be a C.B.C. channel and would be programmed largely by the C.B.C. Have you any suggestion to make as to how the additional costs which would be involved in such an undertaking by the C.B.C. may be met, because you mentioned a figure forty million dollars which would, I think, be the figure mentioned in the Canadian Labor Congress brief. The C.B.C. tell us that with forty million dollars or fifteen dollars per television home, they cannot do these very things which you are advocating, but they require an additional ten million dollars to provide a second network service with an hour and a half programming a day and for the extension of services to areas which are now serviced by

private stations will require additional funds; the forty million dollars is not enough to do the things which you were mentioning as being desirable.

MR. PENNOR: On that question we want to make it quite clear we do not adopt a cavalierish attitude towards finance and say, "let it cost what it may", but we believe that costs cannot always be expressed in terms of dollars in the sense that it might have been cheaper at the time not to build the Canadian Pacific Railway but to use the lines built in the south to convey our goods, but the long term advantage to Canada was such that it was money well invested. We believe that in expressing the figure of forty million dollars that was not meant to be a definitive figure, but merely to express a certain level of statutory grants within the range of one and a half to two percent of the national budget, sufficient to take care of the present costs of C.B.C. and an extending programme which could be publicly agreed to on the basis of representations made to this Commission, and on that basis sufficient statutory grant be given to the C.B.C. to carry out that programme, a programme which is reviewed quite frequently. We have been given a history of those reviews and this is another one which we believe very good.

On that basis it would not be a case of "spend what you want", but it would be in the

national interest to do it.

MR. COYNE: In other words if it were found that to provide the level of programme which on some basis would be desirable in the public interest, it would not deter you in any way if it was going to be necessary to find, say eighty million dollars from public funds rather than forty million dollars?

MR. ROSS: As far as we are concerned, we would have no objection if that was part of the national interest.

THE CHAIRMAN: On this point where you are talking about another T.V. channel in Winnipeg you say on page 2, "viewers in an area as large as this in population are entitled to choice." What has living in a concentrated area got to do with the right to a choice?

MR. PENNOR: The question is well taken, Mr. Chairman and I think perhaps it is merely a bad choice of words. What is intended in the thought there is that economically an area as large as this can perhaps up to a certain point - not entirely - afford two channels, can go some way towards supporting two channels.

THE CHAIRMAN: But there is no God-given right to choice?

MR. PENNOR: That is correct.

MR. COYNE: When you are relating the capacity of this area to support an alternative programme, surely you are speaking in terms of support

for private operations, at least in respect of one of the programmes? In other words, there is nothing about the size of this area which will support a second programming paid out of public funds?

MR. PENNOR: Well, the C.B.C. can and does invite commercial identification with some of its programmes as a means of helping it to subsist. We have been given the condition here that there are some advertisers in Winnipeg who cannot find an appropriate time. It may be that because T.V. is such an influential medium that they want to meet their market and, given a second channel, they would identify themselves with some of the programmes allocated for commercial sponsorship.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 3 where you develop your reasons for preferring public ownership of the second channel, in paragraph (b) you refer to the private stations and say, "We have ample proof that private interests will not meet the essential requirement of utilizing Canadian talent, Canadian material, and Canada's cultural heritage". Do you feel that the private stations should be expected, out of their own resources, to make the same sort of contribution in this field as the C.B.C. is able to do as a direct result of being subsidized with public funds?

MR. PENNOR: There we are hitting the basic point and why we believe that the long-range goal should be complete public ownership, that once a group of men get into this field as business-

-119-

men there primary purpose must be to make a profit, and therefore from that point of view you cannot expect them to duplicate programmes carried out by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation -- from that point of view. It is my contention that point of view is not correct for such a field as broadcasting and television, but once it exists, once it is here and we are living in those conditions, then we believe that C.B.C. should try to have these stations, within the limits of their resources, include as much live programming of Canadian talent as can be done, but that you cannot expect them to be a duplicate of the C.B.C., and that is the unfortunate thing. While we cannot expect them, we would like them to be.

MR. COYNE: And you have already said you would be prepared to see whatever additional public funds may be necessary spent upon providing alternative service of the type you speak of?

MR. PENNOR: That is correct.

MR. COYNE: Down at the bottom of that page you say, "If it were not for the low-cost subsidized sustaining programmes and the advertising revenue commercial programmes distributed free by the C.B.C. to private as well as public stations, many private stations would not be able to exist." I wonder if you have any information that would be a little more specific on the word "many"? For example, we heard from Mr. Speers this morning that although they carried the network programmes, purely

from a business or commercial point of view they would prefer to drop it, and they were satisfied they would do better commercially.

MR. PENNOR: Of course, that was in the field of radio.

MR. COYNE: That was radio.

MR. PENNOR: I accept there is a great deal of difference between radio and television.

MR. COYNE: Well, just on that, even in the television field Mr. Dunton stated in evidence that they were finding increasing reluctance on the part of some stations to carry C.B.C. T.V. programmes for the same commercial reason.

MR. PENNOR: That may be so, but the statement that we include there is based on a speech that Mr. Dunton made on January 9th of this year, and I think he pointed out what is correct, that many of these stations could not have begun operation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think that was his point. He was saying -- and I think most of the private T.V. operators would say the same thing -- that C.B.C. was a great help in getting them started. But, as Mr. Coyne points out, there was some, although not completely unanimous, indication of the view that they wanted to have less C.B.C. programmes than they are having at the present.

MR. PENNOR: Our point is simply this, that we cannot, looking at it as objectively as possible, see the logic of saying, "Here is this group, which enabled us to get started and which

granted us a license, as our competitor." We simply cannot see that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but that is another point.

MR. COYNE: I suppose you would agree that under the present structure of broadcasting, the private stations which disseminate the national service or the network programmes, originated by the C.B.C., are by that very fact providing a national service in the dissemination of those programmes which is somewhat quid pro quo for the fact some of them may not have to pay for?

MR. PENNOR: I think we would welcome the fact that we have, for example, in addition to the Trans-Canada network, the Dominion, and even though it is smaller it enables some of the private stations to carry national programming. I think perhaps one step towards the goal we have in mind in the greater degree of control and public ownership would be to tie in more of the private stations with more of the network programmes emanating from the C.B.C. on either one of its two programmes.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 4 where you are speaking of improving the C.B.C. by constructive criticism, this suggestion you make of local advisory boards; I presume what you have in mind is local boards advisory to the C.B.C.?

MR. PENNOR: That is right.

MR. COYNE: And I suppose it may be somewhat similar to the present National Religious

Advisory Council?

MR. PENNOR: Something of that sort.

MR. COYNE: And special Provincial School Broadcast Committees which now, I understand, advise the C.B.C.?

MR. PENNOR: That is right, some group which would be as representative as possible of all sections of the community and would take into consideration on the basis of their continuous attention to what has been given in the way of programmes, what should be done to develop more programmes utilizing local material, and so on -- utilizing local talent. I would state that as one of their prime criteria, but not necessarily the only one. We are not suggesting only because we have no fixed opinion on it that these advisory boards could or could not be boards of the type that have been suggested by other groups -- that is, actually exercising a degree of control that the C.B.C. operates centrally. That may be an idea, but we are not expressing a pro or con on that question.

MR. COYNE: On the financing question, on page 5, you made a suggestion that the C.B.C. revenues may be related on a percentage basis, say, to the over-all national budget: One of the complaints that has been suggested against the present excise tax method of financing the C.B.C. is that it is wholly unrelated to the kind of service that is being provided or to anything which has anything really to do with broadcasting, and this

places the C.B.C. in some difficulties, because it is difficult to project their revenues. Wouldn't the same sort of thing be true of, say, a percentage of the national budget? It is conceivable that the national budget may be cut in half some day -- conceivable but not likely.

MR. PENNOR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you mean any more by that one or one and a half percent than an indication of the order of magnitude of the thing?

MR. PENNOR: I think so; the main point we wanted to get across in pointing out that the statutory grants being suggested at about the level of 1 to 1½%, from our point of view this cannot be classified as luxury or wanton spending and misuse of public funds. That is why we want to put it in a proper perspective, but I think Mr. Coyne is correct, that to attempt to state this as a statutory regulation would invite a great deal of difficulty.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right; take in Defence; you would never make a provision there that you were going to allocate 50% of your budget. That is not the way you do these things.

MR. ROSS: It is brought forward, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of relative values.

THE CHAIRMAN: This suggestion of a tax on imported canned material: That, I take it, is something in the nature of a tariff on mainly American material?

MR. PENNOR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: One of the questions that the Labour Congress in Ottawa suggested was that much more could be done in terms of expanding our market by exporting the good Canadian productions of the C.B.C., and then I think it is pretty obvious that if you start putting a tariff in one direction you will have more difficulty in shipping goods in another.

MR. PENNOR: On that question, Mr. Chairman, there is the differentiation to be made, and it can be made; for example, between programmes of an educational and scientific nature and programmes of another character. For example, I manage a book store, and when I go down to the Customs to clear books from the United States, if they are of an educational nature they come in free, but if they are novels I pay 10%, and I guess that is the proper way of doing these things.

We also favour the idea of exchange programmes. We certainly would like to see more of the better Canadian material going out.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that suggestion of a tariff is so complex that it has to be either more widely developed and expanded than you have it here, or else we cannot do too much with it.

MR. PENNOR: Well, we don't have the background to do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you for your brief. We will adjourn now until 2.30.

---The hearing adjourned until 2.30 P.M.

--Upon resuming at 2.30 p.m.

CANADIAN COSTUMERS

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we are to hear is from the Canadian Costumers, a group of six companies presented by Mr. C. I. Keith, Q.C., and you here with you Mr. Ross Malabar.

MR. KEITH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will file this brief as Exhibit No.46.

EXHIBIT No. 46: Brief filed by Canadian Costumers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you present your brief, please?

MR. KEITH: As the taxpayers of Canada are footing the bill for the national T.V. network it is important that every effort should be made to keep its operating costs within reasonable bounds and to see that it is operated in accordance with sound economic principles.

Anyone who is familiar with show production realizes that it is fairly difficult to evaluate a dramatic, musical, operatic or variety production in terms of money. Some of the most outstanding and memorable plays, musicals and entertainments are very inexpensive and produced at comparatively low cost. On the other hand, the expenditure of large sums of money does not guarantee the success of a production, either from an artistic or from an entertainment point of view.

It is because of this fact that T.V.

productions along with film and professional stage productions are subject to wide budget variations. It also must be taken into consideration the fact that the so-called artistic temperment which is apparently needed, or which is permitted to the producers of such works, is very impatient of financial restraints.

In stating these facts, however, it is not meant to assert that some line cannot be drawn on a practical basis. Indeed, if certain safeguards are not adopted such undertakings can quickly get out of hand. There are already signs that this is taking place in C.B.C. T.V.

Staffs of technicians, artists, actors, musicians, directors, producers, wardrobe attendants, designers and general hangers on are already rife, and are constantly increasing in numbers. Some very definite and firm policy will have to be devised for containing and restraining this tendency.

In the costume field it has progressed to an amazing degree. To illustrate this I quote from an actual account given by a person who is familiar with the situation in one major C.B.C. outlet:

"The costume setup here is fantastic. They have a staff of 16 girls, 4 tailors, 2 trucks and drivers and 69 costume chosers and fitters. These are apart from the various department heads. This staff is kept on all summer when very few shows are on so as to hold help. With one possible exception, none of these people have previously worked as

as a professional costumer."

To a greater or lesser degree this is the situation in all major C.B.C. T.V. centres. Yet experience in New York, Hollywood and London where T.V. is much older and much bigger than it is in Canada, has shown that private enterprise can supply a wider variety and better costumes at much less cost.

In these three large centres wardrobe departments have been almost entirely discarded in T.V. studios because it was found that the people who are placed on the payroll as wardrobe mistresses and costume designers sat about a good deal of the time without sufficient work to keep them employed.

In a business which produces shows only at intervals, such a situation is unavoidable. The expense of paying regular salaries is out of all proportion to the number of hours of creative effort required to prepare such productions. Furthermore, the cost of the materials used, and the cost of the labor which goes into the making of the costumes is very large in relation to the fee charged for the same costumes by a professional costumer. The cost is at least four and maybe eight to ten times the rental price charged. With very elaborate costumes, of course, even the C.B.C. costume designers and makers admit defeat and simply rent them from the regular sources of supply.

Unfortunately, the cost of a C.B.C. made costume does not end with the purchase of the material and the cost of the labor to make it. It

then becomes a stock liability. It must be stored in very expensive space, handled, cleaned, and checked for moths at regular intervals, insured, etc. and these expenses continue to mount up year after year. The fact is that the majority of costumes which are made for special productions are rarely used again, but continue to cost money year after year and eventually are thrown out to make room for more recent acquisitions. Thus to the original cost of the costume, starting with the salary of the designers, sewers, and the high price of materials obtained at retail prices, must be added the expensive problem of storage and protection.

Some indication may be given on this important subject of cost, this information is also from a source well qualified to report on this going on:

"Actual costs of running a department will never be known. They can be covered up in many different ways by sharp book-keeping practices. Mostly it is done by charging costumes off to capital expense. I gather that they have an unlimited amount for capital expense."

And again:

"The cost of a show is made up overhead, taxes, wages, materials, labor, etc. But C.B.C. T.V. does not operate this way. Their operation appears to take place on capital expense and when a costume or set of costumes is used in a production the costume department charges a rental of five dollars, six dollars, or seven dollars or any arbitrary amount

that is decided upon, so long as it is below what a costumer would charge for the same item. Of course, any costumer could keep books in this way too, except that he has to stay in business.

While we have not available to us the cost of operating the costume departments of the C.B.C. we feel that this commission could ask for and obtain a break-down of all these costs and make this available to the general public. These figures should include not only the salaries of those employed and the cost of the materials purchased but also proper allowance for handling and storing of the costumes already on hand. The space being used for this purpose is very expensive and is a large factor in the operating cost of these departments. The question the naturally arises in the minds of impartial observers is, "What is achieved by this method of operation." "Does the C.B.C. T.V. get better costumes in this way." The answer of New York, Hollywood and London is definitely "no".

No matter how much a T.V. station, theatre or film company sinks in costumes it never begins to approach the volume and variety of costumes available from regular professional costume houses. The following is part of a report of Brooks Costume Company of New York City, one of the two largest costume houses in the United States. This report was given following a survey of the situation in New York:

" It was found that with the networks maintaining their own workrooms to manufacture the women's costumes that are required for their T.V. shows, the cost of them were far higher than if they rented the wardrobe from a costumer and paid for its use at only a fraction of the original cost to make the costume. The network then accumulated a stock of costumes of which they had additional cost for insurance, space for storage, personnel etc. The costumer has other uses for costumes than T.V. and can gradually get back its original cost plus a profit by renting the costume to other clients. Furthermore, they were not in a favourable position to compete unless they invested in a complete line of costumes which cost \$500,000 at a minimum."

Costumes which are made for a particular show never equal in quality or excellence of design the costumes created by regular costumers. This is due to the fact that the costumer rents out his costumes many times to a large variety of customers, and is thus in a position to spend much more on them than would be sensible or feasible for a single production. Another factor which enters into this situation is that fact that the costumers have the top people in the field in their employ. These are the people who know the business inside and out. They are the ones who have the know how and the experience to produce top quality, authentic

creations which distinguish professional craftsmanship in clothes.

Also, large buying power and individual sources of supply enable costumers to purchase needed materials at lower prices, and to select novelty items which are unknown to the C.B.C. employees from all parts of the world. The fact that there are practically no fully qualified and practical costumers in the employ of the C.B.C. bears out what has been said. The C.B.C. has one or two junior costume employees and the remainder of the staff employed is totally inexperienced and unqualified. All that is necessary in order to costume any production properly and economically is that a director or producer of the programme to give the professional costumers a costume plot. The professional costumer has a qualified staff to select, design, create and furnish a production with any type and variety of costume. The cost of the designing, fitting, making and transporting of the costumes will be included in the rental price charged for the individual costumes supplied.

The C.B.C. does not give the costume industry of Canada a fair chance to show what can be done. This is the final complaint of the costumers against the C.B.C. T.V. method of operation.

In most fields it is considered common sense and sound economics, to consult experts who can give qualified advice and assistance.

But in practically every C.B.C. T.V. production no such advice or assistance is sought from the costume profession. Instead, a number of amateurs sit about a table and decide what it is they think should be done. Then, with unlimited expense and very limited know how, they set about getting together what they consider is appropriate.

The professional costumer rarely hears anything about the matter till perhaps a few days before the show is set for presentation then the C.B.C. employees descend upon him with demands for immediate delivery of two types of articles, one, very unusual and complicated paraphernalia which they have finally found out they cannot produce or obtain or substitute and two, the balance of costume sets which they have been unable to complete because they delay too long in starting to make them, and are therefore, caught with the dead line staring them in the face. On these occasions C.B.C. suddenly appear, and pretend to be annoyed at the costumer for not producing the required articles out of a hat on a few hours notice. If they had come to the costumers some weeks previously when the show had been first decided upon, outlined the plot and requirements, and asked his advice and assistance, the costumer could have then turned out the entire production at a cost far below what it ultimately cost the taxpayers of Canada. and I say, without the slightest hesitation,

in a more professional and creditable manner than is usually the result. Practically no effort to date has been made to tap the costume resources of Canada by C.B.C. T.V.

We have a nationally owned and operated corporation, whose chairman has time and again stated that C.B.C. was not going to set up departments in competition with private business, doing exactly this in the costume field. And the T.V. viewers are paying for it both in their taxes and by receiving less than they are entitled to on the T.V. screen.

I would like to say a word or two about the costume industry of Canada. The first costume establishment in this country opened in the year 1869. Today the industry employs over 200 skilled workers and represents an investment of over a million dollars. There are large investments in land and buildings and the industry pays considerable sums in local and federal taxes each year. This industry along with the motion picture industry has been greatly affected by the advent of television. There has been a marked reduction in the number of stage productions as the audiences which formerly attended these performances are now largely engaged in watching television productions. This has meant a very considerable reduction in the revenues of the costume industry and unless regard is taken of this factor the industry will deteriorate to a degree which will seriously

affect its personnel. If this trend continues the general public which relies upon the costume industry for many needs will definitely be affected. Wardrobe stocks built up by C.B.C. will not be available to the general public.

I would like to conclude my remarks by repeating the statement made before, namely, that nothing is being gained by the present policy of the C.B.C. with regard to costuming, either in the way of saving money or in the quality of the costumes being obtained. I urge the C.B.C. to make use of the facilities which already exist and which are quite capable of meeting all its needs if all reasonable opportunity is given.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything further, Mr. Keith, or Mr. Malabar?

MR. KEITH: Only in general, Mr. Chairman, but there is no use throwing old straw and the purpose of this representation is not to look backwards but to look forward and I think it is generally admitted that television in Canada made tremendous strides in the first year or year and a half after its integration and naturally with any industry it is almost impossible to control the opening directions that the various departments take, it grows so rapidly that it is impossible to do it. However, that stage is passed and what we are concerned about more particularly is the future, not the

past. What is worrying the costume industry is that apparently in Toronto and Montreal when the first two stations opened there this system of making costumes was apparently adopted, do not think probably that any deliberate plan was formulated they had to get the productions on and they naturally opened a costume department. However, the thing that worries the costumers is this same plan is apparently being followed in station after station that opened up since in other places and that is what we are concerned about. How it got started and why in Toronto and Montreal I do not know but we would like to see for the future that regard and consideration be given to the professional costume houses which are competent to supply at cheaper than the cost of them new.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Keith, I wonder if you would identify as to location the six firms you are representing, could you tell us where they are in Canada?

MR. KEITH: Barnes is in Regina; Edmonton Masquerade is in Edmonton; Malabar Costumer Limited are in Winnipeg--

MR. COYNE: Excuse me, Malabars are in Winnipeg only?

MR. KEITH: They have offices in Toronto and Montreal. Theatrical Costume Studio are in Saskatoon; Watts and Co. Limited are in Vancouver and Masquerade Costume Company in Victoria.

MR. COYNE: So those are all western firms

except for Malabars offices in Toronto and Montreal?

MR. KEITH: We are speaking mainly for the western firms and I do not think that is surprising, Mr. Coyne, after all, the people in the east are doing business with the C.B.C. and you do not fight with your customers any more than you have to.

MR. COYNE: Well, turning on to page two Mr. Keith, and that point appears in subsequent bits in your brief you point out that in New York and Hollywood and London much of the costuming for the developing T.V. productions is handled by the professional costuming agencies there?

MR. KEITH: It is now.

MR. COYNE: And you argue that that may be comparable to the manner to which it can be done in Canada. What I was going to ask you, whether you would care to comment on it or not, is this that surely in places like New York or London where there is a very large and active legitimate theatre the facilities which are offered by the professional costumers in those places must be much greater than would be available in any Canadian centre, including the largest,

MR. KEITH: I would not think so, I think Malabar Costumers is one of the largest costume houses in the world and this statement about New York, perhaps I did not make it clear but that is a more recent tendency I think originally

the networks did start out as C.B.C. did to build up their own costume department and it is only in the last five or six years that they have gradually figured out that they were not making but losing by it and they have gradually cut down their departments and rely on the costumer to supply them.

MR. COYNE: Do you know whether the C.B.C. when it was commencing operations did canvass the situation with the professional costumers?

MR. KEITH: I think they just went ahead, that is what happened.

MR. COYNE: Why do you say on the top of page 4 that the C.B.C. has to pay retail prices for its materials, is that so?

MR. MALABAR: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Why is it that the costumers are in a position to buy more cheaply than the C.B.C?

MR. KEITH: Well, that of course depends on two or three factors. The fact is they buy quite an amount through the costumers. Now, any new materials, the materials for costumes are not the ordinary materials that would find, usually find on the counters of a retail store, they are inclined to be gaudy and garish and they are secured in bulk through a few stores and in large quantities and, first of all, in just doing a show they would not buy enough of any one type of material to make it possible for them to get a wholesale price, and secondly, the people,

and this is what I tried to point out, the people who are in the costume departments are not in touch with the source of supply that the costumers are. I mean, quite honestly, they have not people, they have been picked up off the street, some could make nice dresses at home and that sort of thing.

MR. COYNE: No professional experience?

MR. KEITH: That is right, they start out the same as you and I might start out, they have a problem and they look for materials and they find what they can here and there in the stores and very often end up in the costume houses.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this really buying from your clients at retail prices?

MR. KEITH: To a considerable extent, yes.

MR. COYNE: You refer on page 4 of your quotation from an informant to sharp book-keeping practices.

MR. KEITH: I did not like that work myself.

MR. COYNE: Well, are you charging the C.B.C. with sharp practices?

MR. KEITH: This person is not exactly a literate sort of person, but I do not think he means what you are implying the words mean, to me it does not look like --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Except, Mr. Keith, when you put it in a brief you adopt it.

MR. KEITH: I scratched it out a couple of times but then put it back in again.

MR. COYNE: You are not making the charge for which this language might perhaps lead someone to believe you were making?

MR. KEITH: No.

MR. COYNE: I have the same sort of question about this word unlimited that you use, you say in one place there is an unlimited amount and further on at page seven you talk about unlimited expense, would you care to qualify the use of that word in the same way.

MR. KEITH: Well, yes, I think it is clear what he means by putting it into a capital cost account it is hidden when you go to figure out the cost of the individual production on its own and it is unlimited to his way of thinking when he compares it to what a professional costumer might feel that he could afford to do.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I wonder how they got the knowledge that the C.B.C. could charge this into captial account?

MR. KEITH: He works there in the department.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you say Mr. Malabar does not know of his own knowledge as to how they charge it?

MR. KEITH: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would be surprised if this were a correct statement of fact.

MR KEITH: Well, I do not know.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: As a matter of fact, you have used three quotations here which are rather damning and only identify one of the persons who

made the statement.

MR. KEITH: That is the best I could do, but Mr. Malabar wants to make a comment on that.

MR. MALABAR: With regard to costume rentals themselves, we had an incident locally in which the amount of the total costume rentals for the show exceeded the figure of \$200 and we were told that such was not possible but that anything over that had to be charged to capital expenditure. Therefore, it follows that if the C.B.C. T.V. are manufacturing their own costumes and it did not show for that particular show, they would have been forced to charge it to capital expenditure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it might or might not follow, I do not think it necessarily follows, but we can find out about this.

MR. KEITH: That is what we suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it be found out.

MR. COYNE: In substance, Mr. Keith, what you are suggesting to the commission is that there are these professional costuming facilities available in Canada and to the extent they may usefully be used the C.B.C. should look into the situation and find out whether they can be used.

MR. KEITH: I can give you a specific example of that, as recently as a week ago there was a production on the Winnipeg station in which there were 36 costumes used and I am informed that all these costumes were made and available on the

racks at Malabars and could have been had for a very nominal rental. They were newly made costumes of a stock kind which could have been had by simply phoning and having them there. I think in a case like that there is no excuse for making a standard kind of thing. If it is something unusual there may be some excuse because the costumer can do that quicker and easier than they can but there was the incident, the dance of the nations, with all of the costumes hanging on the rack not two blocks from where the show was going on and no inquiry was ever made to see if they were available.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Is there not a possibility that these costumes could be used completely by the C.B.C. so they could be amortized.

MR. KEITH: The costumers tell me it is not, that their rental price - of course, it depends on the type of costume, a simple costume can be rented very often and rented very cheaply, if you want an expensive one that is very seldom rented you pay a higher price but the ordinary standard type of thing that is used time and again can be obtained very cheaply and they are kept up, they are cleaned, they are stored and so forth and transported at a very nominal cost.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was not clear on your comment to Mr. Coyne when he suggested it would not be likely that the costumers in the east would

be making the submission because you said they were already doing business with the C.B.C?

MR. KEITH: Yes, we are doing business all over.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But you want to do more?

MR. KEITH: Well, it is declining and it has been declining as the departments in the stations have been built up. Naturally, when you have a crew like that they must do something for their money, they must produce something so the number of occasions of the costumers being called on is decreasing.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the group that you have here from these various cities, how many programmes in a year would originate in those cities which would call for costumes.

MR. KEITH: I have no idea.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mentioned that one a few weeks ago, when was the last one before that when it originated in Winnipeg?

MR. KEITH: Two or three in the last month, I was in one myself, I must admit.

MR. COYNE: You are very versatile. Those are the only questions I had.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The only question I have, does the C.B.C. to your knowledge have a costuming department in every place where they produce shows?

MR. KEITH: To the best of my knowledge.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Have you any idea of the number of people employed in those departments,

MR. KEITH: No, it is very difficult to get that and that was one of the things we suggested the Commission might ask for information on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Keith, we are eager to have any suggestions that can be put forward whereby the costs of this operation may be reduced but we will have to look into it to see whether it is a practical suggestion or not.

(Page 1144 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we will hear will be that of CKSB Radio-Saint-Boniface Limitée, to be presented by Dr. P. E. Laflèche, President, and Mr. Roland Couture, Manager. We will mark this brief as Exhibit 47.

EXHIBIT NO. 47: Brief presented by Radio-Saint-Boniface Limitée.

SUBMISSION OF RADIO-SAINT-BONIFACE
LIMITEE.

APPEARANCES:

M. Roland Couture

M. Le Commissaire Turcotte

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Monsieur le président, messieurs les membres de la Commission. Radio-Saint-Boniface Limitée est heureuse d'avoir l'occasion de présenter à la Commission royale d'enquête sur la radio et la télévision, ses points de vue sur les questions de principe touchant le développement et l'avancement de la radiodiffusion sonore et de la télévision au Canada.

Radio-Saint-Boniface Limitée, incorporée en vertu d'une charte fédérale en 1944, exploite le

poste de radio-diffusion sonore CKSB sur une fréquence de 1250 kilocycles, à une puissance de 1000 watts, à St.-Boniface, Manitoba. Ce poste a coûté, depuis ses débuts, environ \$150,000.00 à la population canadienne-française qui en est le seul propriétaire. Depuis de nombreuses années le groupe franco-manitobain désirait être desservi dans sa langue à la radio, mais les seules émissions françaises dont il pouvait jouir lui venaient, en quantité minime, de Radio-Canada par son émetteur de Watrous.

Etant donné la distance de la province du Manitoba de ce poste émetteur, seuls quelques-uns pouvaient capter ces émissions dont le nombre ne pouvait suffire aux besoins toujours grandissants d'une population de plus de soixante mille personnes, groupées dans les villes de St-Boniface et Winnipeg et en une soixantaine de villages dont la plupart sont situés dans un rayon d'environ cent milles de St-Boniface, le centre français le plus important de l'Ouest canadien.

Après avoir longuement étudié le problème, les Franco-Manitobains décidèrent de prélever eux-mêmes les fonds nécessaires à l'érection d'un poste radiophonique. Tous les Canadiens français du Manitoba furent encouragés à participer à une souscription qui bientôt pris les allures d'une campagne nationale et qui déborda les cadres de la province.

En mars 1944, une demande de permis fut présentée aux Gouverneurs de la Société Radio-Canada et en mai de la même année les Gouverneurs de cette même société recommandaient l'octroi de la licence. Deux ans plus tard, le 27 mai 1946, le poste était lancé. CKSB était le premier poste français de l'Ouest canadien et depuis dix ans il a fonctionné à la grande

satisfaction de toute la population manitobaine.

Le poste CKSB a été organisé pour répondre à un besoin culturel et social de la population canadienne de langue française du Manitoba. La direction du poste s'est fixé quatre grands objectifs: promouvoir la culture française, éduquer, récréer, renseigner.

Depuis ses tout débuts CKSB a essayé de rester fidèle à ces grandes lignes, raison d'être de son existence.

Jusqu'à l'avènement de la radio il y avait au Manitoba français plusieurs organisations culturelles qui eurent chacune dans son domaine un rayonnement bien-faisant. Cependant presque toutes ces sociétés culturelles exerçaient leur influence surtout à la ville, et la population rurale, qui forme pourtant la majorité du groupe français, retirait assez peu d'avantages de ces différents mouvements. Aujourd'hui, grâce à la radio, certaines de ces associations culturelles rayonnent dans un nombre de foyers éloignés et se font dispensatrices de culture française.

Soulignons que la Société Radio-Canada, grâce à ses émissions culturelles et autres, contribue également d'une manière éminente à la diffusion de la pensée et de l'expression française parmi nous.

Nous avons, en plus de ces initiatives d'enseignement populaire et de culture, d'importantes maisons d'enseignement et de puissants organismes d'éducation. Ainsi le Collège de St-Boniface, L'Association d'Education des Canadiens français du Manitoba, la Société Canadienne d'Enseignement Post-scolaire (section française du Manitoba), la Bibliothèque Publique de St-Boniface - autant

d'organisations dont l'action était plutôt restreinte et le rayonnement limité avant l'avènement de CKSB.

Aujourd'hui, grâce à la radio, toutes ces associations peuvent par des séries de causeries ou de cours, par des programmes spéciaux destinés aux enfants, aux étudiants ainsi qu'à la population adulte, tant de la ville que de la campagne, atteindre des auditoires nombreux et variés. Ainsi on peut signaler les émissions radiophoniques suivantes qui sont à l'horaire, à titre gratuit:

"Oncle Léo." Programme quotidien destiné aux enfants en vue de les éduquer, de les renseigner et de les récréer - durée trois quarts d'heure.

"Université du Manitoba." Programme hebdomadaire de quinze minutes qui permet aux universitaires de faire connaître leurs talents.

"Association d'Education des Canadiens français du Manitoba". Programme de diction et d'orthographe qui permet aux adolescents et aux adultes de mieux connaître la langue française - durée d'une demi-heure une fois la semaine.

"Nos écoles au micro". Programme hebdomadaire d'une demi-heure inauguré dans les écoles du Manitoba.

"Les jeunes artistes de CKSB". Emission hebdomadaire de quinze minutes pour faire connaître les jeunes talents.

"CKSB présente." Emission de quinze minutes présentée en vue de faire entendre les artistes du Manitoba.

"L'Heure Exquise". Tous les soirs de la semaine CKSB fait entendre à ses auditeurs une heure de musique classique.

"A l'opéra". Tous les jours, de 2h. à 2h.30, le poste présente des extraits d'opéra.

"Promenade musicale". Tous les jours, de 2h.30 à 3h., le poste présente des oeuvres classiques.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Tous ces programmes sont une création de votre propre poste?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui, monsieur.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Sont-ils soutenus commercialement?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Non; ce sont des programmes présentés à titre gratuit.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Pourriez-vous les vendre, le cas échéant?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Très difficilement. Nous constatons que, dans le domaine commercial, il est difficile de vendre des programmes de musique classique ou semi-classique en tranches d'une demi-heure. Nous avons, en quelques occasions, vendu de l'opéra, le dimanche après-midi et, à certaines occasions, nous avons vendu le programme de L'Heure exquise. Je dirais qu'en général cinq pour cent de ces émissions sont commanditées.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: De celles que vous avez mentionnées?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui, de toutes celles dont j'ai fait la nomenclature.

L'agencement de ces programmes a suscité l'approbation et l'admiration d'un nombre grandissant d'auditeurs tant de langue anglaise que des autres groupes ethniques du Manitoba.

De fait le journal quotidien de Winnipeg, le Winnipeg Tribune, rapportait dans ses colonnes la déclaration du professeur Duncan, de l'Université du Manitoba, et qui se lit comme suit:

CONTROL vs FREEDOM. DEBATE ON RADIO AND TV.

Said Prof. Duncas: "The CBC has donne a magnificent job. I want to keep it. What it has done has been underestimated, even by intellectuals. There's a gigantic struggle in Canada between people with standards and those who don't give a damn for anything but filling their pockets. I'm not impressed with the performance of private radio stations, except CKSB. Private stations do nothing for local talent. It's a spectacle of general uselessness - a warning of what would happen if we had more TV stations".

CKSB ne prétend pas se substituer à des organismes déjà engagés dans ce champ d'activité. Il est cependant souvent possible d'inclure dans des programmes récréatifs, des éléments de culture et d'éducation, tout comme on peut ajouter des côtés récréatifs aux programmes sérieux. C'est ce que CKSB essaie de faire dans la présentation des émissions.

Le Manitoba français n'ayant pas de journal quotidien, CKSB a été appelé à jouer un rôle important, non seulement au point de vue nouvelles, mais encore en fournissant à la population les informations requises sur les marchés, la condition des routes, la température, les prévisions du temps et autres détails utiles tant au cultivateur le plus éloigné qu'au citadin lui-même.

La nouvelle joue cependant le premier rôle et c'est pour cela que notre radio-journal et nos bulletins d'information sont si fidèlement suivis. En vue de compléter notre services de nouvelles, nous interviewons les personnalités marquantes de passage et offrons, en plus, de nombreux commentaires sur les événements courants.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Où vous procurez-vous ces services de renseignements pour votre radio-journal et vos bulletins d'information?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Nous sommes affiliés à la British United Press et, depuis quelque temps, à la Presse Canadienne. Nous avons des traducteurs qui prennent les nouvelles en anglais et qui les traduisent en français.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Vous n'avez pas le service français de la Presse Canadienne?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Non; le service français de la Presse Canadienne ne vient pas jusque dans l'Ouest. Dans le domaine local, nous avons seize reporters qui nous téléphonent s'il y a des incendies, des événements quelconques, et nous avons un service de renseignements organisé dans la ville.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: De sorte que vous donnez des renseignements originant de la région?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui, et dans le domaine national et international. Dans le cas de catastrophes ou d'incendies nous avons des reporters. Pour vous illustrer un point que j'ai en mémoire: en 1950, lors de l'inondation, nous avions un tiers de la population canadienne française demeurant dans la vallée de la Rivière Rouge, qui était affectée par les eaux. Les autorités municipales nous ont demandé d'être sur les ondes vingt-quatre heures par jours, pendant vingt jours. Nous avons lancé au delà de 4800 messages pour dire aux gens de ne pas se déplacer ou pour les diriger vers les trains, etc.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: En coopération avec les autorités de Winnipeg et du Manitoba?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui, et la Croix Rouge, la Caisse de Bienfaisance, etc. Nous sommes toujours en contact très intime, et très agréable, avec les postes de radio du Manitoba et d'ailleurs.

La Commission royale d'enquête sur l'avancement des arts, lettres et sciences au Canada, instituée par un décret du Conseil Privé le 8 avril 1949, a fait dans son rapport certaines recommandations ayant trait aux postes français en dehors du Québec. Qu'on nous permette d'en citer les passages suivants - (page 346-ul):

- "p) Que, dès que les fonds nécessaires seront disponibles, la Société Radio-Canada procède à l'organisation d'un second réseau français et à l'établissement d'un poste de radiodiffusion en langue française, pour desservir la population francophone des provinces Maritimes; qu'elle élabore aussi et mette en oeuvre au réseau français une émission spéciale comparable à l'émission dite Wednesday Night du réseau transcanadien.
- q) Que la Société Radio-Canada songe ^à sérieusement/utiliser les postes de langue française de l'ouest canadien comme débouchés pour les émissions d'envergure nationale en français, soit au moyen d'enregistrements soit par quelque autre moyen."

Les Canadiens d'expression française de l'ouest canadien, qui avaient consenti à de lourds sacrifices en érigeant leurs quatre postes, se sont profondément réjouis de ces recommandations. Ils se sont sentis justifiés et récompensés de leurs efforts en contribuant à la réalisation, sur un plan national, d'un canadianisme compréhensif. En effet, ils ont fourni au gouvernement canadien l'instrument voulu pour rendre possible la recom-

mandation de la Commission royale.

En effet, dès le 26 octobre 1952, la Société Radio-Canada, tenant sans doute compte des recommandations de la Commission Massey, étendait son réseau français à l'Ontario et aux provinces de l'Ouest, au grand bien culturel de tous les intéressés qui purent, eux aussi, puiser à des sources aussi variées que bienfaisantes.

En raison des circonstances qui ont motivé leur création, nos postes radiophoniques de l'Ouest canadien ne peuvent être complètement assimilés à des postes commerciaux. Leur première préoccupation est précisément de maintenir et diffuser la culture française, élément constitutif de notre civilisation canadienne. En le faisant, nos postes ont conscience d'avoir eux aussi mérité les éloges attribués à Radio-Canada par la Commission Massey, en ces termes (page 327 - article 15):

"Au début de la radiodiffusion, le Canada était vraiment menacé d'annexion culturelle par les Etats-Unis. Les mesures prises à l'égard de la radiodiffusion par des gouvernements émanant de tous les partis ont permis au pays de conserver son identité culturelle. Toutefois, la radio canadienne a fait bien davantage. Elle a préparé la voie à une connaissance et une entente mutuelles qui parassaient impossibles quelques années plus tôt. Les Canadiens, en tant que peuple, ont écouté les nouvelles de leur propre pays et du monde entier, ont entendu nos experts traiter des questions d'intérêt public, ont assisté ou participé

à la discussion de problèmes canadiens et ont pu également, grâce à la radio, prendre part aux grandes manifestations nationales. Tout cela est tellement évident aujourd'hui, qu'on oublie facilement combien en ont bénéficié plus particulièrement les nombreux Canadiens qui vivent plus ou moins isolés, privés de journaux et dont les rapports avec le monde extérieur sont très réduits."

Notre poste au Manitoba répond donc, dans une large mesure, à ce que la Commission Massey attend de la radio: "Renseigner, former et divertir une population clairsemée composée d'éléments divers ... développer le sens de l'unité nationale entre nos deux grandes races et entre nos groupes ethniques".

La situation relativement à la télévision est bien différente de celle de la radio. Ici les Canadiens français de l'Ouest n'ont actuellement que deux heures d'émissions en français, limitées au Manitoba. Ils ne peuvent donc jouir des bienfaits culturels et sociaux dont profitent les Canadiens d'expression française de l'est du pays. En somme ils en sont à la situation qui existait avant l'établissement de leurs postes français de radiodiffusion sonore.

S'il est vrai que l'Ouest canadien tout entier a bénéficié et continue de bénéficier du fait des postes français; s'il est vrai que les postes en dehors du Québec témoignent mieux que tout autre organisme de la double culture du Canada, il est clair que la télévision nationale se doit de suivre la même formule.

Les Canadiens d'expression française dans l'Ouest canadien se sentent incapables d'assumer seuls le coût formidable de postes téléviseurs. Par consé-

quent ils se tournent vers la Société Radio-Canada et vers le gouvernement de leur pays, leur demandant de bien vouloir leur fournir, par les moyens qu'ils connaissent, des programmes qui répondent à leurs besoins sociaux et culturels.

En conséquence, Radio-Saint-Boniface Limitée se plaît à faire les trois recommandations suivantes:

- a) Que là où la Société Radio-Canada utilise les postes privés comme débouchés de ses programmes, ces postes reçoivent une compensation équitable lorsqu'ils font passer les programmes de Radio-Etat.
- b) Que la Société Radio-Canada utilise davantage les postes privés, là où ils sont éloignés des grands centres culturels, pour présenter des programmes mieux adaptés à leurs auditoires.
- c) Que la Société Radio-Canada prenne les moyens nécessaires pour assurer la télévision dans les deux langues et que des subsides supplémentaires lui soient votés pour en arriver à cette fin.

Le tout respectueusement soumis à la Commission d'enquête sur la radio et la télévision par Radio-Saint-Boniface Limitée.

M. JEAN de GRANDPRE: Si vous permettez, je vais pousser les questions peut-être assez loin, étant donné le genre particulier d'opérations et tenant compte particulièrement du fait que vous semblez, sur la base de l'entreprise privée, faire ce que Radio-Canada entreprend sur une base nationale et avec des fonds publics.

Pourriez-vous me dire quel est le début de l'organisation financière du poste?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Tout d'abord, laissez-moi vous dire que nos compagnies sont des compagnies privées; mais que les postes de l'Ouest, les quatre postes de l'Ouest, appartiennent à la population Canadienne française de l'Ouest. Nous avons lancé une souscription générale. Au Manitoba nous avons perçu \$148,000.00, et les autres provinces ont suivi le pas. Nous avons commencé par intéresser tous nos centres. Pour chaque \$500.00 contribués dans un centre, ils envoient un délégué à l'assemblée annuelle; ce qui veut dire qu'à une réunion annuelle nous avons 165 membres présents -- une moyenne de 165 à 170 -- qui, chacun d'eux, représente \$500.00 d'argent souscrit. Ils se réunissent et choisissent les actionnaires. Les actionnaires représentent les centres. Mais lorsque nous prenons la charte d'actionnaires nous signons une formule disant que nous remettons nos droits aux successeurs de St-Boniface ou d'ailleurs. C'est pour cela qu'en anglais, ils disent "Owned and operated by the Listeners".

Lorsque nous avons manqué d'argent dans notre construction nous sommes allés revoir les gens et, dans les quatre provinces de l'Ouest on a souscrit les sommes suivantes: le Manitoba, \$148,200; l'Alberta, \$215,851.00; la Saskatchewan: le sud, \$192,253., le nord, \$212,117; ce qui veut dire que la population de 175,000 Canadiens français des trois provinces ont donné \$718,000. pour mettre sur pied quatre postes.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Par souscription populaire?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Ces \$500. que vous donnez, c'est pour des actions?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: C'est pour envoyer un délégué.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Un groupe qui a souscrit \$500.00 a droit d'envoyer un délégué?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui. S'ils ont souscrit \$5,000.00 ils ont droit à dix délégués. Prenez St-Boniface. Nous avons trente-six délégués parce que nous avons souscrit \$18,000.00. Ces trente-six délégués ont droit de vote pour choisir les actionnaires.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: C'est en quelque sorte une coopérative, mais à fonds perdus?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui, à fonds perdus. En plus de ça, quand on a un déficit, il faut payer. Radio-Ouest française fut l'organisation coordinatrice dans le début. C'est là qu'on peut dire que les quatre postes de l'Ouest sont devenus le petit réseau français dans l'Ouest. Le poste CKSB est le poste-clef pour le commercial et, avec l'alimentation commerciale à St-Boniface et dans les autres postes on a pu rencontrer les bouts passablement. On se rend compte que les gens demandent davantage et qu'il faudrait avoir plus d'argent. Par exemple, on devrait avoir, au Manitoba, un agronome qui pourrait s'occuper de nos besoins d'agriculture. Comme c'est là, nous prenons le programme de Radio-Canada qui est bien fait mais qui est peut-être trop vaste pour couvrir le pays. Lorsqu'on parle de sirop d'érable, ça ne s'adapte pas ici. Avoir un agronome, c'est \$10,000.00 par année. Nous tâchons de maintenir le poste aussi bien que nous le pouvons. Nous avons vingt employés qui sont payés peut-être aussi bien que la majorité des autres postes et peut-être mieux. Ils sont tous bilingues. Il faut absolument connaître les deux langues. Ils traduisent du français à l'anglais et de l'anglais au français continuellement.

M. de GRANDPRE: Et les actionnaires délégués par ces groupes élisent un bureau de direction.

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui, un bureau de direction composé de quinze membres.

M. de GRANDPRE: Et ce bureau de direction ne s'occupe pas de façon permanente de l'organisation du poste, mais délègue ses pouvoirs à un gérant?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui; c'est moi qui suis le directeur-gérant. Dans ce directorat de 15 membres, pris à la ville et à la campagne, on a généralement un exécutif de huit membres.

M. de GRANDPRE: Maintenant, vous nous avez indiqué tout à l'heure que vous aviez recueilli \$148,000. pour le Manitoba?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui.

M. de GRANDPRE: Et je vois dans votre mémoire, à la page 2 "Ce poste a coûté, depuis ses débuts, environ \$150,000. à la population canadienne-française qui en est le seul propriétaire". Pourriez-vous nous dire tout d'abord quel en est le coût original?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Ca nous a coûté \$104,000. Le coût original a été de \$84,000, et depuis ce temps-là nous avons dû ajouter de l'équipement. Il y a dix ans nous n'avions pas de machines à enregistrer, et aujourd'hui nous en avons quatre. Il a fallu faire certaines transformations. Il a fallu agrandir. Le coût a été de \$104,000.

M. de GRANDPRE: Le solde c'est pour combler les déficits annuels?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Non; ce sont les déficits des trois premières années. En 1946, c'était la fin de la guerre et nous étions pour commencer à une certaine date. On nous a demandé de suspendre nos travaux. Le personnel déjà engagé est resté au poste et, de ce facteur, la première année d'opérations a

accusé un déficit de \$18,000.00 y compris l'amortissement et la dépréciation.

M. de GRANDPRE: Est-ce que je dois comprendre que depuis 1949 ou 1950 le poste a été capable d'opérer sans faire de pertes trop substantielles?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: C'est exact. Je ne voudrais pas vous faire croire qu'on a trop d'argent, mais on peut opérer modestement.

M. de GRANDPRE: Vous opérez combien d'heures par jour?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Nous opérons 16 heures 15 minutes par jour. Nous commençons à 7 heures 05 jusqu'à 11 heures 10 le soir; sauf le dimanche: 14 heures.

M. de GRANDPRE: A même ces 15 heures 15 minutes d'opération, vous recevez combien d'heures du service français de Radio-Canada?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: 27 heures, en moyenne, par semaine, et là-dessus nous avons 5 heures de programmes commerciaux.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Quel est le total d'heures de la semaine?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: 111 heures 5 minutes. Nous opérons 16 heures 15 minutes par jour et le dimanche 14 heures. Nous commençons à 9 heures jusqu'à 11 heures 10. Sur ces chiffres-là, en moyenne, nous avons de 27 à 30 heures de réseau.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Sous quelle forme?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Nous avons le fil français.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: C'est simultané à ce qu'ils présentent à Montréal?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui. Le bulletin de 10 heures 30, à Montréal, nous l'avons ici à 9 heures

ou 9 heures 30.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Vous le recevez directement au même moment?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Certains programmes directement et certains programmes par l'entremise de Radio-Canada, à Winnipeg. Ils vont nous le retransmettre si les heures ne correspondent pas avec le temps dans l'Ouest. Il y a deux heures entre Montréal et Edmonton.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Est-ce que les autres postes français sont reliés en même temps que vous?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: C'est pour cela que vous le recevez simultanément?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Les créations dramatiques et musicales qui passent à Montréal passent ici, mais pas toujours à la même heure?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Des fois nous les prenons directement et des fois il faut faire le raccordement à Winnipeg. Prenez, par exemple, des programmes musicaux. Ils ne pourraient pas les passer ici à 7 heures et en Alberta à 5 heures.

M. de GRANDPRE: Quelle est la nature des programmes que vous recevez du réseau français de Radio-Canada?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Nous avons deux bulletins de nouvelles de cinq minutes par jour. Nous avons le bulletin d'information qui passe à Montreal à dix heures, que nous prenons à 9 heures. Nous avons le programme des agriculteurs, le midi. Nous passons des programmes tels que "L'Avenir de la Cité", "Fémina", "Nature du sol", "Visages de l'homme", "Le choc des

idées", "Revue des arts et lettres", "Les idées en marche", "Revue d'actualité". Je vous donne les grandes lignes.

M. le GRANDPRE: Ce que vous recevez, est-ce que ce sont les programmes de soutien et non pas les programmes commerciaux?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Sur 27 heures nous avons 5 heures de programmes commerciaux pour lesquels nous sommes payés.

M. le GRANDPRE: Quant au reste ce sont des programmes de soutien pour lesquels vous ne payez rien et pour lesquels vous ne recevez rien?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Et pour lesquels nous aimerions recevoir quelque chose.

M. le GRANDPRE: Sur les programmes que vous créez ici, à Winnipeg, quelle serait la proportion des programmes qui sont des programmes de soutien comparativement aux programmes que vous vendez?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Ici, dans le marché où nous sommes, nous vendons quelques-uns. A St-Boniface, le gros de notre commerce vient des annonces-éclair, des bulletins de nouvelles et des bulletins sportifs. Nous nous organisons à peu près comme ceci: de sept heures à 12 heures 30, nous tâchons de placer passablement de commerciaux pour l'auditoire du matin et là, nous avons les programmes de Radio-Canada commandités. De midi et demi à 1 heure 30 nous essayons de faire des programmes pour nos agriculteurs etc, de 2 heures à 3 heures nous donnons une tranche de musique classique ou semi-classique. De 3 heures à 4 heures 30 nous avons de la musique du bon vieux temps, pour tâcher de plaire à tous les auditeurs. A 5 heures 15 nous avons le programme des enfants, jusqu'à 5 heures 30. De 5 heures 30 à 5 heures 45 nous avons de la musique légère, et

à 5 heures 45 nous avons le programme "Un homme et son péché". De 6 heures à 6 heures 15 nous avons un bulletin de programmes sportifs.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE : Vos nouvelles sont commanditées?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui, à peu près 14 ou 15 bulletins de nouvelles commandités par des maisons d'affaires de Winnipeg et d'ailleurs. A l'heure du souper nous avons de la musique et des annonces-éclairés et des nouvelles. A compter de 7 heures 30 jusqu'à 10 heures nous avons plusieurs programmes de Radio-Canada: et de 10 heures à 11 heures, L'Heure Exquise. C'est là que nos compatriotes de langue anglaise apprécient le poste. Nous avons l'opéra, l'après-midi, tous les dimanches.

M. deGRANDPRE: Avec l'expérience que vous avez, pourriez-vous dire quelle est la proportion de programmes commerciaux qu'un poste doit avoir pour boucler son budget?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Là, vous posez une question à laquelle il est difficile de répondre. Ça dépend du marché, ça dépend de la valeur de la minute. Moi, je dirais que pour opérer d'une façon confortable il faudrait qu'un poste ait 75 pour cent de commercial. La radio demande un service complémentaire. Il y a quelques années la nouvelle n'avait pas le même cachet. Aujourd'hui, il faut aller sur les lieux. Pour les parties de hockey il faut aller sur les lieux. Ça demande de l'équipement pour être à la page. Dans notre cas, prenez le montant d'argent que nous dépensons chaque année pour la musique classique. Nous avons de 25 à 30,000 oeuvres, et tous les mois nous en achetons. Nous avons une

discothèque pas mal complète.

Pour encourager nos écloes et nos jeunes talents on peu dépenser cent, deux cents ou trois cents dollars par semaine pour envoyer un type dans les écoles pour enregistrer, les faire chanter. Si on veut faire l'historique de nos paroisses, si on veut démontrer à notre population qu'on est un peuple canadien et qu'on est fier de l'être, il faut dépenser pour faire des programmes.

M. leGRANDPRE: Et avec 75 pour cent de vos programmes commandités, vous pourriez opérer d'une façon confortable?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui. Nos programmes commandités, dans notre cas, ne doivent pas dépasser 55 pour cent. Je vous donne cela grosso modo: je pourrais le préparer.

M. leGRANDPRE: Pourriez-vous, pour le bénéfice de la Commission et puisque vous nous l'offrez, nous préparer les chiffres qui nous permettraient d'établir la proportion des programmes commerciaux nécessaires dans un district comme le vôtre pour boucler le budget et opérer de façon confortable et, quand vous parlez de façon confortable, si c'est pour donner un dividende ordinaire?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Dans notre cas, le poste n'a pas été mis sur pied pour faire de l'argent: mais pour payer de bons salaires et se servir du surplus pour donner de meilleurs programmes. Si je pouvais mettre sur pied un programme agricole ça prendrait un agronome. Cinquante pour cent de nos auditeurs sont de la campagne. Parmi nos jeunes talents, nous sommes fiers de dire que Gisèle

Laflèche-MacKenzie a commencé ici. Henri Bergeron vient d'ici.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Vous dites que Gisèle Mackenzie a débuté à St-Boniface?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui. Son père travaille pour nous, et voici son oncle ici.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Vous avez donc fait une contribution?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui, et mademoiselle Louise Roy, il y a quelques années. Il y en a d'autres aussi qu'on a tâché d'aider. C'est pour cela que j'aimerais qu'on reconnaisse un groupe ethnique comme le nôtre et que Radio-Canada nous donne une formule pour permettre aux talents locaux de se développer. Nous sommes tellement loin des centres culturels, de Montréal, Calgary et Toronto. Il faut décentraliser la radio et la télévision. Dans notre cas, je constate que nous ne sommes pas nombreux. Par contre, à Moncton, on leur a fourni un poste: et nous, nous avons payé pour. J'ai déjà fait des comparaisons. Nous avons ice 8.4 pour cent de la population. La ville de Québec avait 6.4. Le réseau anglais est allé à Québec et ici, nous n'avions pas de réseau français. À mon avis, il me semble que les Canadiens doivent être traités sur la même base; les taxes viennent de la même source. Je trouve qu'il y a deux langues ici: et nous devrions nous sentir chez nous à Toronto, Montréal et Vancouver. Si nous maintenons cette double culture nos hommes d'affaires pourront se dispenser de traducteurs dans n'importe quel domaine: et plus tard on va se développer vers l'Amérique du Sud et c'est là que la culture française permettra aux Canadiens

d'apprendre une autre langue. Je vois dans le Canada un pays qui va se développer plus qu'on pense dans le prochain demi-siècle.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: A la page 5, après l'énumération des programmes, vous dites: "L'agencement de ces programmes a suscité l'approbation et l'admiration d'un nombre grandissant d'auditeurs tant de langue anglaise que des autres groupes ethniques du Manitoba".

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Avez-vous un moyen de savoir dans quelle mesure les auditeurs de langue anglaise de Winnipeg et de la région écoutent votre poste?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Nous avons un moyen tangible: le nombre de lettres que nous recevons d'auditeurs de langue anglaise, le nombre d'appels téléphoniques que nous recevons des auditeurs de langue anglaise -- je ne dis pas qu'on en reçoit des centaines par soir, non, mais cinq ou six. Au début de l'année nous avons toujours quelques belles lettres des groupes universitaires. Les programmes universitaires sur nos ondes sont autant de langue anglaise que de langue française. Ce sont des étudiants qui viennent chez nous une fois la semaine et qui présentent un programme musical, et de ces groupes-là je crois qu'il y en a seulement un qui est Canadien français; les autres sont des Anglais. Prenez "L'Heure Exquise". Nous avons ici une population de 75000. Le pourcentage par famille est de 4.2.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: 75,000

Canadiens français dans tout le Manitoba?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui. Nous en atteignons, avec le poste, 70 à 72 pour cent. Il y a quelques groupes qu'on n'atteint pas le soir. C'est dire qu'il y a 18000 à 20000 foyers canadiens-français. Le dernier sondage a démontré qu'il y avait 40,000 familles dans une semaine qui écoutaient notre poste; ce qui prouve que nous en avons énormément dans les foyers de langue anglaise.

M. de GRANDPRE: Le programme qui est écouté par la personne de langue anglaise, est-ce que c'est un programme qui est spécialement conçu pour elle ou si c'est un programme qui est conçu pour vos auditeurs canadiens-français?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Autant que possible nous essayons de concevoir nos programmes pour les Canadiens-français. Sur une heure de musique il n'y a pas plus que cinq minutes de présentation: ce qui veut dire que la musique, on en jouit, qu'elle soit en français ou autrement. Nous avons un programme très populaire: "Lets Learn French". Nous avons un professeur d'université qui donnait un cours. Mais c'est devenu trop coûteux. Il fallait envoyer les cours et payer le professeur. On envoyait environ 2300 questionnaires par semaine. On se fait demander souvent: "Pourquoi est-ce que vous ne recommencez pas votre programme?" Il y avait un double embêtement: pour certains c'était cette année, d'autres l'année suivante. Après trois ans on a discontinué parce qu'on trouvait que c'était trop compliqué: mais c'est un programme qui a pris beaucoup. Nous avons à Winnipeg dix à quinze mille Anglo-saxons qui comprennent le français et nous avons

beaucoup de néo-Canadiens qui comprennent le français.

M. deGRANDPRE: Je vous pose la question parce que le professeur Reid, hier, nous a indiqué, qu'à son sens, il y a possibilité et probabilité de rejoindre l'auditeur anglo-saxon si le programme est particulièrement conçu pour lui. Vous avez en partie réalisé cet objectif avec ce programme : "Lets Learn French". Est-ce que vous avez tenté beaucoup d'autres expériences comme celle-là?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Non: mais ce qui nous a empêchés c'est le nerf de la guerre. On a bien des idées, mais il faut payer.

M. deGRANDPRE: Parlant du nerf de la guerre, on va y rester. Je comprends que vous avez des difficultés financières et que vous demandez de l'aide d'une façon quelconque?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui.

M. deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous avez songé en particulier à la formule selon laquelle l'aide pourrait se concrétiser?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Je crois, personnellement, que la formule la plus pratique serait une formule "tant de l'heure". Si, par exemple, Radio-Canada exige de nous 27 heures de programmes de soutien par semaine et qu'on dise : "pour 20 heures on va vous demander le tarif X".

M. deGRANDPRE: Ce tarif, est-ce que vous seriez prêt à le prendre sur la base des tarifs qui sont fixés par Radio-Canada pour les programmes commandités, à savoir, un pourcentage de la valeur de l'heure?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Nous serions prêts à faire certaines concessions. Maintenant, il faudrait s'entendre.

M. deGRANDPRE: Mais vous êtes sous l'impression que c'est la façon pratique d'envisager le problème à l'heure actuelle?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Je crois que c'est une des façons les plus pratiques et les plus équitables si nous voulons que les postes français gardent leur autonomie. Maintenant, si un moment donné Radio-Canada disait : "Est-ce que vous seriez prêts à nous laisser prendre votre poste?" Personnellement, je serais prêt à dire qu'en autant qu'ils assumeront les responsabilités qu'on a assumées : l'information, la culture, etc... L'information, ici, c'est très important.

M. deGRANDPRE: En somme, est-ce que la formule du réseau français de Radio-Canada conviendrait ici? Je ne parle pas de ce que vous recevez; de ce qui se produit sur le réseau français?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Là, j'admets que certains programmes s'appliquent très bien. Dans les programmes culturels, il faut admettre qu'au Manitoba nous ne pouvons pas comparer le nombre d'auditeurs avec ce qu'ils peuvent avoir dans l'Est du Canada. Nous devons admettre que nous sommes les fils des pionniers et que certains programmes comme Radio-Collège, c'est peut-être trop élevé; et si on n'atteint pas la masse le pourcentage que nous atteignons est petit. Est-ce qu'il ne serait pas mieux que Radio-Canada donne des programmes moins élevés pour qu'on puisse élever le niveau de la

masse.

M. leGRANDPRE: Vous ne voulez pas mettre le niveau trop haut, au risque de tout perdre?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Il faut graduer.

M. leGRANDPRE: A cause de cela, vous considérez qu'une sélection au niveau Winnipeg est nécessaire?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Au niveau Manitoba.

M. leGRANDPRE: Une sélection au niveau Manitoba, Saskatchewan et Alberta est nécessaire?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Sans cela vous perdez votre auditoire.

M. deGRANDPRE: Vous nous avez dit tout à l'heure que vos bulletins de nouvelles, programmes de nouvelles et autres de même nature étaient vendus. Est-ce que, dans votre expérience, vous avez trouvé là une objection particulière à vendre des programmes de nouvelles?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Non. Habituellement les commanditaires aiment un bulletin de nouvelles parce qu'ils savent qu'à cette heure-là les gens sont habitués d'écouter. Nous avons un bulletin de nouvelles à toutes les heures. On sait que les gens écoutent habituellement les bulletins de nouvelles et les bulletins sportifs.

M. deGRANDPRE: On arrive maintenant au dernier item. Quant au système de télévision, est-ce que vous avez élaboré un plan concret pour desservir la population franco manitobaine?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Voici: actuellement nous profitons, au Manitoba, seulement de deux heures d'émissions télévisées par semaine, le

dimanche après-midi.

M. deGRANDPRE: Seulement le dimanche?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui. A mon sens, il faudrait que nous en ayons tous les jours. Si vous avez seulement un poste téléviseur, eh bien, qu'on donne une heure par jour. Advenant qu'il y ait un autre canal à Winnipeg, qu'on donne deux heures par jour. Je crois qu'à Winnipeg - je peux faire erreur - un poste de télévision bilingue pourrait peut-être fonctionner, en vertu duquel on aurait deux ou trois heures de français par jour et ensuite l'anglais. Je crois qu'il y a des commerçants qui aimeraient à annoncer et qui ne peuvent pas acheter du temps sur le réseau CWTB. J'aimerais à ce que le réseau donne une heure par jour et deux heures s'il y a deux postes; ou qu'on exige du nouveau poste qu'il donne une heure de français par jour de ses émissions.

M. deGRANDPRE: Ce qui représenterait quoi, prenant pour acquis que ça reste de même?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: 12 et demi pour cent.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: A condition qu'il y ait qu'un seul canal?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui. Ici, commercialement parlant, je ne pense pas qu'un poste exclusivement français puisse vivre en télévision. D'abord, le coût d'exploitation est beaucoup trop élevé. Un poste bilingue aurait peut-être une chance de vivre.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Comme deuxième poste?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Oui.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Il faudrait que ce deuxième poste soit d'entreprise gouvernementale, parce qu'il ne pourrait pas subsister. Il faudrait que ce deuxième poste, s'il donnait des programmes de langue française, soit un poste de Radio-Canada?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Probablement. Si un poste pouvait obtenir ses émissions françaises à la source de Radio-Canada et qu'ensuite il opère commercialement, il y aurait peut-être moyen; mais je n'ai pas fait d'étude au point de vue chiffres. Il y a eu tellement de variance dans les chiffres, que je n'aimerais pas les donner.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: D'après les renseignements que nous avons ici, un deuxième poste, même s'il était en langue anglaise, celui-là ne pourrait pas faire ses frais à moins d'être, lui aussi, aidé. A plus forte raison si ce deuxième poste consacrait certaines heures aux programmes français, parce que ça rapporte moins. Par conséquent, il faudrait que ce deuxième poste soit un poste de Radio-Canada?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Je pense que oui.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Ce serait dans le but d'intérêt général?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: C'est cela.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Le président me prie de vous remercier beaucoup de votre intéressant mémoire.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that of Radio-Ouest-Française, to be presented by Dr. L. O. Beauchemin and Mr. Roland Couture. We will mark this brief as Exhibit 48.

EXHIBIT 48: Brief submitted by Radio-Ouest-Française.

SUBMISSION OF RADIO-OUEST-FRANCAISE

APPEARANCES:

Dr. L. O. Beauchemin

M. Roland Couture

DR. L. O. BEAUCHEMIN: Monsieur le président, messieurs les commissaires. Dès les débuts de Radio-Canada, aux environs de 1933, les Franco-Canadiens de l'Ouest canadien se sont occupés du problème des émissions françaises et de la radio française en général. Ils ont fait de nombreuses requêtes aux autorités fédérales en vue d'obtenir des programmes français plus nombreux et mieux adaptés à leurs besoins locaux. Graduellement ils en vinrent à la conclusion que la seule solution était pour eux de construire leurs propres postes.

En août 1941, un groupe de représentants de chacune des trois provinces dites "des prairies" se réunissaient à Prud'homme, en Saskatchewan, et au cours de deux journées d'études jetaient les bases d'un vaste projet: la construction de quatre postes

radiophoniques voués aux intérêts culturels et sociaux des Franco-Canadiens de l'Ouest canadien. Il fut décidé que chacune des trois provinces formerait son comité provincial qui verrait à la souscription dans son propre milieu. Entre-temps le comité provisoire, formé à Prud'homme, continuerait d'exister et servirait d'agent de liaison entre les groupes et l'extérieur.

En janvier 1944 eut lieu à Saint-Boniface une réunion des représentants des comités provinciaux et on fonda officiellement "Radio-Ouest-Française", société faite de membres des groupements provinciaux, qui fut chargée d'organiser la souscription en dehors des provinces de l'Ouest canadien et de demander les permis d'exploitation au gouvernement canadien.

En mars 1944, Radio-Ouest-Française organisa une importante délégation qui entrevit les Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada et leur présenta une requête en vue d'obtenir les permis pour quatre postes français : deux pour la Saskatchewan, nord et sud, un pour le Manitoba, un quatrième pour l'Alberta. Les délégués furent reçus avec sympathie par les Gouverneurs et en mai de la même année, 1944, une recommandation fut envoyée aux autorités, recommandant l'octroi d'un premier poste, à Saint-Boniface.

Immédiatement la souscription s'organisa dans chacune des provinces de l'Ouest et atteignit en peu de temps la somme fabuleuse d'au delà de \$750,000.00 souscrits sur une base bénévole par les Canadiens d'origine française, pour ériger et faire fonctionner les postes français de l'Ouest. Egalement en 1945, une grande souscription était

lancée dans l'est du pays, surtout dans la province de Québec, mais cette dernière déborda en Nouvelle-Angleterre, dans les provinces maritimes et en Ontario.

Au cours de l'été 1945, les travaux du premier poste se poursuivirent à Saint-Boniface et, malgré les retards occasionnés par la guerre, l'ouverture officielle du poste se fit il y a dix ans cette année, le 27 mai 1946. Radio-Ouest-Française reprit ses démarches en vue d'obtenir les autres permis. Le 28 mars 1948, le gouvernement fédéral et les Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada recommandaient l'octroi d'un permis aux Franco-Albertains et le 20 novembre 1949 avait lieu l'ouverture du second poste français de l'Ouest canadien, celui d'Edmonton, que l'on nomme CHFA. Enfin, au cours de mai 1951, les Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada recommandaient l'octroi de deux postes français pour la Saskatchewan, le premier à Saskatoon et le second à Gravelbourg.

L'existence de postes français dans l'Ouest canadien a contribué puissamment au progrès de la culture française, tant auprès des Canadiens d'expression française que ceux de langue anglaise. Elle a contribué à une meilleure entente entre les deux éléments constitutifs du pays. Elle a permis aux autorités qui nous gouvernent de rendre meilleure justice à l'élément minoritaire.

L'avènement de la télévision pose déjà des problèmes authentiques. Les Canadiens de langue française qui habitent l'Ouest canadien, depuis le Lac Supérieur jusqu'au littoral de l'océan Pacifique, se rendent compte et des

avantages culturels qu'ils pourraient tirer de cette invention nouvelle et de l'infériorité où les place actuellement la marche générale des programmes télévisés. Que vont-ils faire? Peuvent-ils, encore cette fois, y aller d'eux-mêmes et construire leurs propres postes?

L'expérience a prouvé qu'il est impossible de vouloir donner des programmes français et anglais, à la radio comme à la télévision, sans déplaire à un élément important de la population. Et les Canadiens français de l'Ouest canadien ne seront pas satisfaits de quelques bribes que, sous couleur de tolérance, on pourrait leur offrir.

Il faudrait donc trouver un moyen de servir à l'élément canadien-français de l'Ouest des programmes qui répondent à leurs besoins culturels et sociaux et qui s'harmonisent avec leur sens de la vie. Ce problème demande une étude sérieuse. Jusqu'à quel point pourrait-on compter sur l'apport financier des groupes français des provinces de l'Ouest canadien? Comment compter sur les commanditaires, dans le cas de programmes exclusivement français?

Ne conviendrait-il pas que le gouvernement fédéral encourage l'étude de ce problème? Les officiers de Radio-Ouest-Française estiment que c'est là la première chose à faire. Que Radio-Canada prenne les mesures nécessaires pour rencontrer les directeurs des quatre postes français de l'Ouest canadien, tout comme les représentants du groupement de langue française de la Colombie Britannique. C'est là le vœu exprimé par Radio-Ouest-Française.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you bring out that very special arrangements were made for the opening of two Saskatchewan French stations?

DR. L. O. BEAUCHEMIN: I understand that there were very special finance arrangements made for the opening of those two particular stations, yes.

M. deGRANDPRE: Docteur, quant à Radio-Ouest-Française, est-ce que vous pourriez nous dire s'il s'agit là tout simplement de l'association des quatre postes ou d'un réseau particulier? Quelle est la nature exacte de Radio-Ouest-Française?

DR. L. O. BEAUCHEMIN: L'association des quatre postes français.

M. deGRANDPRE: Quand il s'est agi de former le réseau français de l'Ouest, est-ce que c'est Radio-Ouest-Française qui en a pris l'initiative ou les postes en particulier?

DR. L. O. BEAUCHEMIN: Radio-Ouest-Française a pris l'initiative de demander du français au gouvernement et nous avons, pendant de nombreuses années, demandé au gouvernement de nous donner du français à la radio. Nous avons eu quelques succès avec les postes privés et ensuite Radio-Etat a pris les postes et nous avons essayé d'avoir notre part de français à Radio-Etat. Nous avons rencontré les ministres à Ottawa, et finalement nous nous sommes réunis à Prud'homme et nous avons discuté de la question et, avec les renseignements que nous avons, nous avons résolu de bâtir des postes privés pour l'élément français des trois provinces.

M. deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, je comprends qu'à Saint-Boniface le poste CKSB a été construit à même les fonds recueillis, sans aucune aide extérieure?

DR. L. O. BEAUCHEMIN: Oui, sans aucune aide extérieure.

M. deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que la même chose s'est produite en Alberta et en Saskatchewan, ou s'il y a eu de l'aide extérieure?

DR. L. O. BEAUCHEMIN: Vous voulez dire sans aucune aide extérieure de la province?

M. deGRANDPRE: Des gouvernements fédéral et provincial?

DR. L. O. BEAUCHEMIN: Edmonton est sur le même pied que le Manitoba. C'a été souscrit par des fonds canadiens-français.

M. deGRANDPRE: Est-ce qu'il y a une situation différente quant à la Saskatchewan?

DR. L. O. BEAUCHEMIN: Si je comprends bien, les postes de Saskatchewan sont aidés par le gouvernement.

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Pour l'érection des postes, ce sont les capitaux canadiens-français qui ont mis les postes sur pied et qui les ont bâtis. Maintenant, est-ce qu'ils ont une entente différente? Je ne suis pas au courant. Je crois qu'il y a une nuance dans leur entente que nous n'avons pas.

M. deGRANDPRE: Ni l'un ni l'autre, aujourd'hui, n'êtes en mesure de nous donner des détails?

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Je préférerais qu'ils vous les donne quand ils comparaitront devant vous, parce que je pourrais faire erreur.

M. deGRANDPRE: Tout à l'heure, quand M. Couture nous a donné un résumé du mémoire de CKSB, il nous a indiqué qu'au point de vue télévision il

réalisait qu'un deuxième poste de télévision, de façon à donner satisfaction à l'élément français au Manitoba, devrait être comme un poste opérant d'une façon bilingue; une partie des heures devrait être consacrée à l'élément français et une partie des heures consacrée à l'élément anglais. Je vois à la page 4 de votre mémoire:

"L'expérience a prouvé qu'il est impossible de vouloir donner des programmes français et anglais, à la radio comme à la télévision, sans déplaire à un élément important de la population." Je me vois pris dans un dilemme.

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Je pense que ce que le docteur voulait dire, c'est qu'on nous a répété tant et plus qu'à Montréal et Ottawa il avait été très difficile de faire fonctionner un poste bilingue à la satisfaction de tous. Maintenant, de quelle manière cette dissatisfaction s'est démontrée? Je ne suis pas en mesure de le dire.

DR. BEAUCHEMIN: Pour revenir à l'historique, lorsque Radio-Canada avait son poste à Watrous, nous demandions du français. Nous en avons eu quelques bribes, et chaque fois que nous nous présentions à la Commission ou chez les ministres, c'était de nous dire: "Il y a trop de réactions contre vous, on ne peut pas vous en donner plus". C'était déjà très minime. Alors, nous sommes venus à la conclusion que c'était difficile d'avoir du français sans déplaire aux autres qui étaient en majorité. Et c'est un peu dans cet esprit que nous croyons qu'il serait difficile de faire accepter un poste qui donnerait du français et de l'anglais.

Maintenant, je peux vous dire que je suis à Calgary depuis 41 ans, et la situation n'est pas ce qu'elle était autrefois. Le français n'est pas honni

comme il l'était autrefois. Aujourd'hui on accepte le fait français. Je suis médecin; je cause avec mes confrères; et je sais que l'élément professionnel de nos villes est anxieuse d'entendre du français. Il semble que la culture française est mieux appréciée; et nous nous trompons peut-être lorsque nous disons qu'il serait difficile d'avoir un poste bilingue de télévision qui puisse donner satisfaction aux deux groupes. Ce sont là des expériences qu'il vaudrait la peine de tenter pour en avoir la réaction.

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Quant à moi, c'est ce que je voulais vous demander étant donné que j'ai couvert le terrain avec le docteur Beauchemin.

DR. BEAUCHEMIN: Nous sommes pas mal solidaires.

M. ROLAND COUTURE: Avez-vous quelque chose à ajouter?

DR. BEAUCHEMIN: Je crois que ça couvre le terrain.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Seriez-vous d'accord, Dr. Beauchemin, avec l'expression d'opinion exprimée par le professeur Reid qui exprime le point de vue -- il s'agissait de radio, nous pourrions l'étendre à la télévision -- que le public de langue anglaise serait heureux d'entendre de temps en temps des programmes d'une langue et de l'autre? Il suggère qu'il n'y eut pas de réseau complètement anglais ni complètement français, mais un réseau à prépondérance anglaise et un autre à prépondérance française. Est-ce que vous pourriez étendre cela à la télévision? Croyez-vous que vous auriez une réaction non pas hostile, mais de mécontentement de la part des téléviseurs de cette partie du pays à consacrer trop de temps à la langue française?

DR. BEAUCHEMIN: Nous avons le sentiment que la population anglaise en général tolère beaucoup mieux le français; et je me plais quelquefois à dire à mes compatriotes canadiens-français qui, quelquefois, ont une tendance à ne pas connaître le français complètement: "Les Anglais deviendront plus bilingues que nous au Canada", parce que nous sentons que l'élément supérieur veut apprendre le français. Maintenant, il y a la masse. Il n'y a aucun doute qu'il y aura des réactions de la part des ouvriers qui sont moins cultivés. Je crois que la chose mériterait beaucoup d'attention tout de même.

THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you for your very interesting brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next submission we have is from L'Association D'Education des Canadiens-Français du Manitoba represented by Dr. P. E. Laflèche. It will be Exhibit 49.

EXHIBIT 49: Brief submitted by l'Association d'Education des Canadiens-Français du Manitoba.

SUBMISSION OF L'ASSOCIATION D'EDUCATION
DES CANADIENS-FRANCAIS DU MANITOBA.

APPEARANCES:

Dr. P. E. LaFlèche

Frère Joseph Bruns

Je suis accompagné ici du Frère Joseph Bruns, principal de l'Institut Collegial Provencher.

Monsieur le président, messieurs les commissaires. Les membres de l'Association d'Education des Canadiens Français du Manitoba vous remercient sincèrement de la bienveillance avec laquelle vous voulez bien nous permettre aujourd'hui de vous faire connaître notre association et vous soumettre un mémoire sur diverses suggestions susceptibles d'améliorer les programmes de radio et de télévision.

L'association d'Education des Canadiens français du Manitoba qui représente tous les manitobains de langue française, soit environ 66,000, célèbre cette année son quarantième anniversaire.

Seule organisation bénévole au Manitoba qui s'est toujours occupée d'éducation à tous les degrés scolaires, tant primaire qu'universitaire, elle a pour but de conserver la culture française dans notre province et d'en assurer le rayonnement.

On vous a mis au courant, cet après-midi, de la situation actuelle de la radio et de la télévision au Manitoba, en ce qui concerne les citoyens d'expression française. Je me bornerai donc, avec votre permission, d'énumérer brièvement les suggestions mentionnées dans notre mémoire. Premièrement celles qui se rapportent à la radio:

Nous favorisons l'aide financière du gou-

vernement fédéral aux postes privés en particulier à ceux qui offrent bon nombre de programmes éducationnels et culturels. Ils sont un facteur de progrès dans la civilisation proprement canadienne.

Nous apprécions beaucoup la qualité artistique des programmes de Radio-Canada mais nous croyons que certains programmes tels que "Naissance du poème" Radio-Collège, sont d'un niveau trop élevé pour être appréciés à leur juste valeur.

Nous désirons plus de programmes canadiens, des programmes concernant l'Histoire, la géographie; programmes éducatifs pour les enfants des écoles. Nous avons ici quelques réalisations locales.

Nous aborderons maintenant trois points qui se rapportent plutôt à la télévision. Premièrement, à propos des programmes, nous suggérons:

Qu'on ait au moins un minimum de deux heures de français qui aurait été supprimé, par une représentation ultérieure dans la journée ou la semaine;

Qu'on donne moins de longs programmes et un plus grand nombre de programmes français qui durent un quart d'heure ou une demi-heure;

Qu'on donne les programmes de télévision française à différents jours de la semaine;

Que la Société Radio-Canada multiplie ses programmes éducationnels en ajoutant des programmes récréatifs pour les enfants d'âge scolaire; des programmes descriptifs qui parlant à l'ouïe et à la vue rendront de grands services pour l'enseignement de l'Histoire, des sciences naturelles, de la géographie, de la musique, etc.

Que Radio-Canada laisse davantage aux postes privés les programmes d'ordre purement récréatif.

Qu'il y ait à Winnipeg un responsable de la télévision française, un responsable qui connaisse la nature et la qualité des programmes français dont il dispose et qui, en même temps, comprenne bien la mentalité, les goûts et le degré de culture des Franco-

Manitobains.

Quant au bilinguisme, nous recommandons:

Que la Société Radio-Canada favorise un bilinguisme formateur par la diffusion de programmes de réalisation canadienne à la télévision et à la radio.

Il en découlerait de multiples avantages et nous en signalons ici quelques-uns:

Les groupes minoritaires français qui vivent en dehors du Québec en retireraient beaucoup de profit;

Les citoyens d'expression anglaise de ces provinces y trouveraient un moyen d'apprendre le français d'une manière agréable et plus facile. Ceci, avec des cours mais des cours bien préparés qui s'adaptent. "Proper approach", comme on dit en anglais. Ces cours ont été bien suivis dans les stations de l'Est et les résultats semblent intéressants.

Ces programmes encourageraient l'étude de la langue française puisqu'ici au Manitoba l'enseignement du français est permis depuis la quatrième année.

Ce serait un facteur de compréhension et de bonne entente entre les deux grandes races de notre pays.

Concernant les postes privés: Nous favorisons l'érection de postes privés de télévision même là où Radio-Canada a ses propres postes. Que ces postes reconnaissent le fait français et nous servent à l'occasion des programmes dans notre langue.

Il se produirait ainsi une saine émulation

entre les postes, les auditeurs auraient plus de choix et là où il se donnerait des programmes français, les téléspectateurs qui ne comprennent pas le français n'auraient qu'à choisir l'autre ou un des autres postes qui donnent des programmes anglais.

Nous comptons surtout sur Radio-Canada pour la diffusion de ces programmes français, étant donné que cette société doit refléter à travers tout notre pays le plus pur canadianisme et les aspirations d'un peuple qui grandit grâce à l'apport de deux cultures éminentes de notre civilisation occidentale: la culture anglaise et la culture française.

M. deGRANDPRE: Docteur, si vous permettez, je vais passer à travers le mémoire que vous avez soumis et tenter de clarifier peut-être certaines choses. Je vois qu'à la page 2, sous l'entête "Administration financière", au deuxième paragraphe, vous dites: "Nous favorisons l'aide financière du gouvernement fédéral aux postes privés". Est-ce que vous avez une suggestion concrète à faire dans ce sens-là ou si vous partagez l'opinion que M. Couture a exprimée tout à l'heure, que Radio-Canada devrait payer pour le temps octroyé, si vous voulez, aux postes privés pour permettre la diffusion des programmes français à travers le pays?

DR. P. E. LAFLECHE: Je dirais que ce serait là une des façons les plus équitables si ça rencontre les besoins, plutôt que de demander des subsides directs.

M. deGRANDPRE: Vous croyez qu'il s'agirait là d'une façon de vendre le temps du poste en question?

DR. P. E. LAFLECHE: Oui, je crois que ce serait un rajustement financier plus facile et plus équitable, si cela répond aux besoins; pourvu

que les rendements soient suffisants.

M. deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, un peu plus bas, vous dites: "Un grand nombre d'auditeurs de langue anglaise syntonise CKSB à cause de la valeur de ses programmes de musique". Est-ce que vous avez d'autres statistiques que celles qui ont été données par M. Couture tout à l'heure, ou si vous vous basez sur les mêmes données?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: A peu près les mêmes, parce que nous n'avons jamais fait de relevé; mais par les relations que nous avons avec les différents groupes nous voyons un peu la réaction des gens à ce sujet-là, soit dans nos relations journalières ou avec les différentes organisations.

M. deGRANDPRE: Et à la page 3, vous commencez en disant: "Nous apprécions beaucoup l'aide apportée par le réseau français de Radio-Canada". Est-ce qu'il s'agit d'aide financière ou d'aide en vous fournissant gratuitement les programmes de soutien que vous passez sur les ondes des postes de l'Ouest?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Pour moi, je dirais que cette contribution qui est fournie par les programmes de soutien de Radio-Canada nous aide énormément.

M. deGRANDPRE: Et c'est à cette aide que vous réferez quand vous faites cette déclaration-là?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Oui.

M. deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, il a été question tout à l'heure, à plusieurs reprises, du nombre des Canadiens-français au Manitoba et on a mentionné à plusieurs reprises 66,000, 67,000 ou 68,000. Est-ce que vous pourriez nous dire si tous les Canadiens-français du Manitoba parlent le français ou si l'origine ethnique, si vous voulez,

peut être un moment donné française et que, avec les générations, les enfants ou les petits-enfants ne parlent pas le français de leurs aïeux?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Les relevés qui ont été faits sont un peu différents selon ceux qui les font. Nous en avons faits, nous en avons du gouvernement et nous en avons aussi par nos centres à nous, à cause des ramifications de l'Association qui couvre tout le Manitoba. Ces statistiques qui ont été présentées à 66,000 étaient des statistiques du recensement de 1950.

M. deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous avez quelque part des statistiques qui indiqueraient le nombre aussi exact que possible des gens qui parlent définitivement le français?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Bien, c'est assez difficile parce qu'il y a beaucoup de gens qui le parlent, et si vous vous adressez à eux ils vont vous parler en anglais; mais ils parlent bien le français. Même si vous prenez l'assonance des noms - Johnson, par exemple, il peut ne pas parler l'anglais.

M. deGRANDPRE: Vous avez, par exemple, dans cette région, des gens qui s'appellent Murdock et qui ne parle pas l'anglais et d'un autre côté vous aurez des gens qui s'appellent Courchesne et qui ne parlent pas français?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Nous avons environ 225 écoles sous notre juridiction et nous avons un certain nombre d'élèves qui fréquentent ces écoles, et nous savons qu'ils sont de langue française.

M. deGRANDPRE: Et si on prend les statistiques qu'on nous a données tout à l'heure, ces élèves-là font partie de foyers familiaux qui compteraient trois ou quatre autre personnes?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: C'est assez difficile à juger.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Vous dites: "Au Manitoba l'étude du français est au programme des écoles publiques à partir du grade 4". Est-ce que c'est facultatif?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Oui.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Tout en étant facultatif, avez-vous une idée du nombre d'enfants qui profitent de l'offre qui leur est faite? Je veux dire des élèves qui ne sont pas de langue française et qui choisissent d'étudier le français?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Je demanderais au Frère Bruns de répondre à cette question.

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: C'est cette année seulement qu'on a commencé l'enseignement du français dans le grade 4. Avant cette année ils commençaient toujours au grade 7. Je dirais que les trois quarts des élèves dans toute la province apprennent le français dans le grade 7.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Ce sont des écoles de l'Etat, de la province?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Oui.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Les trois-quarts des élèves, à partir du grade 7, apprennent le français?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Oui.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: C'est toujours facultatif?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Oui.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Même si c'est facultatif, les trois-quarts en profitent?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Oui.

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Ils doivent apprendre une autre langue et ils choisissent le français plutôt que l'allemand.

M. deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que cette proportion a varié ou s'il y a d'autres statistiques disponibles?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Ca va prendre encore quelques années avant que les élèves prennent avantage du grade 4. Les écoles sont divisées en Junior High School à partir du grade 7, et c'est là qu'ils commencent à apprendre le français. Les grades 9, 10, 11, c'est le Senior High School.

M. deGRANDPRE: Nous avons touché ce point-là quant à la sélection qui doit se faire sur le réseau français de façon à atteindre le niveau de la masse franco-manitobaine. Vous êtes en accord avec les énoncés de principe qui ont été donnés par M. Couture tout à l'heure?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Oui.

M. deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, les gens qui sont venus présenter des mémoires avant vous ont discuté assez longuement des programmes récréatifs et des programmes purement récréatifs; et je vois que vous touchez également ce point-là. A la page 5, au deuxième paragraphe, vous dites: "Etant donné que la Société Radio-Canada est plus en mesure que les postes privés de satisfaire à ces objectifs, nous l'encourageons à multiplier ses programmes éducationnels et à laisser davantage aux postes privés les programmes d'ordre purement récréatif." Est-ce que vous pourriez élaborer un peu cet énoncé-là?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Au point de vue des programmes éducationnels, je dirais que la télévision devrait donner des démonstrations de science,

géographie, Histoire. On peut présenter des scènes canadiennes, on peut montrer comment se comportent les Canadiens dans les différentes parties du Canada, les occupations de tous les Canadiens. Je dirais aussi que pour les élèves de High School on doit présenter des films sur l'orientation professionnelle; ça manque totalement et ça peut rendre un service énorme.

Au point de vue civisme, on peut montrer, par exemple, comme on a montré dernièrement, l'ouverture du Parlement à Ottawa. On peut faire la même chose ici. On peut montrer comment marche le gouvernement municipal. Il me semble qu'au point de vue éducationnel ça doit être facile de préparer des programmes intéressants.

M. deGRANDPRE: Mais la question que je voulais éclaircir particulièrement c'est: jusqu'à quel point certains programmes sont des programmes récréatifs et certains autres sont des programmes éducationnels. Quand vous arrivez dans le théâtre, dans la danse, dans le chant, il est difficile un moment donné de tirer la ligne, et quand vous commencez sur cette pente-là c'est difficile d'arrêter avant d'être arrivé au bas de la pente. Quel genre de programmes avez-vous à l'esprit quand vous dites que les programmes purement récréatifs doivent être laissés aux entreprises privées en opposition aux programmes éducationnels qui doivent être laissés entre les mains de Radio-Canada?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Ici, par exemple, à Winnipeg, on voit Lassie et d'autres programmes semblables. C'est purement récréatif et on doit laisser tout ça aux postes privés.

M. deGRANDPRE: Dans le domaine de ce que les autres personnes ont appelé "The Light Entertainment Field", je veux avoir votre opinion pour savoir

jusqu'à quel point on peut aller.

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Il me semble que je peux recommander la Famille Plouffe.

M. deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous croyez qu'il s'agit là d'un programme purement récréatif ou s'il est à la fois un programme éducationnel?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: C'est récréatif mais ça donne une idée des moeurs de Québec; si c'est la ligne.

M. deGRANDPRE: Quand vous arrivez avec les "Soap Operas"?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Ca, c'est de l'autre côté.

M. deGRANDPRE: Ca, c'est clairement récréatif?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Oui.

M. deGRANDPRE: Ce n'est pas très formateur?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Non.

M. deGRANDPRE: Toujours dans ce domaine-là, quoique le programme lui-même ne soit pas un programme éducationnel et qu'il soit clairement à tendance récréatif, est-ce qu'il n'y a pas là une opportunité pour les nouveaux talents de se développer dans des rôles secondaires et par la suite prendre une part plus grande aux programmes plus substantiels?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Il me semble que si nous avons un poste canadien-français on pourrait présenter tous ces programmes. Il me semble qu'on doit insister sur le côté éducationnel dans les programmes qui nous sont fournis.

DR. P. E. LAFLECHE: Nous avons des programmes ici, comme le dimanche, des films qui ne sont pas réellement de l'heur à plaire à tout le monde. On entend très peu de commentaires le dimanche.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Pouvez-vous nous donner une idée en quoi consistent ces deux heures par semaine. Qu'est-ce que vous recevez en moyenne sur l'ensemble du choix possible, pendant ces deux heures?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Pour la plupart, il y a des films français qui durent une heure et demie à deux heures.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Vous ne recevez pas de kinéscope des programmes directs qui auraient été faits à Montréal; des programmes qui sont donnés à Montréal et qu'on pourrait faire passer ici?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Des fois il vient des kinésopes, mais bien des fois ce sont des films qui durent une heure et demie à deux heures.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: C'est votre pâture pour la semaine et vous préféreriez des programmes plus éducatifs?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Oui, et par périodes moins longues.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Le poste CEWT donne combien d'heures d'émissions par jour?

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: C'est huit heures par jour.

Me. deGRANDPRE: Le représentant de Radio-Canada m'informe que c'est 74 heures par semaine.

FRERE JOSEPH BRUNS: Ca se peut.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Et là-dessus vous recevez deux heures qui sont en général des films français?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Oui. S'il arrive qu'il y a des programmes très importants on retranche toujours les programmes français pour les remplacer par le football ou autre chose.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Même certaines semaines vous n'avez pas ces deux heures?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Absolument.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Au début, lorsqu'on a commencé à vous donner des heures de français, combien y avait-il d'heures totales d'émissions? 74 heures?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Il y en avait moins.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: On vous donnait deux heures quand même?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Oui.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Vous avez toujours eu deux heures, quelle que soit la durée de la semaine, dans l'ensemble?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Si je comprends bien, c'est une suggestion de votre Association que la proportion devrait être stable?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: C'est une question de formation. On ne peut pas toujours marcher sur une question de pourcentage. Nous parlions de deux heures par jour. Là, nous avons deux heures par semaine. A moins de deux heures c'est difficile de préparer des programmes intéressants et d'obtenir des résultats concrets. Si nous avions deux heures par jour, mais réparties dans des programmes plus courts et variés, des programmes éducatifs où l'on peut développer quelque chose au point de vue science, géographie et faire ressortir des sujets formateurs plutôt que de nous donner une pièce de théâtre qui, quelquefois, laisse à désirer.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je vois que vous êtes en faveur d'un poste privé de télévision. Ce poste privé de télévision, est-ce que vous l'entrevoyez

comme recevant des émissions de Radio-Canada ou si vous l'entrevoyez comme étant complètement détaché du système national?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Mon opinion personnelle, je ne crois pas qu'il puisse se maintenir lui-même sans être alimenté par Radio-Canada.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, on nous a indiqué lors de nos séances à Ottawa qu'il en coûte à Radio-Canada environ \$100,000.00 par année pour alimenter un poste qui dépend partiellement du réseau national. D'un autre côté, il y a encore plusieurs éléments de la population canadienne qui ne sont pas desservis du tout par la télévision. Est-ce que vous ne considérez pas qu'il serait préférable, étant donné les moyens financiers restreints qui sont mis à la disposition de Radio-Canada, tout d'abord de desservir tout le pays pour ensuite donner un choix dans les grands centres?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Est-ce qu'ils sont limités dans leur budget au point

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous seriez surpris de savoir jusqu'à quel point la Société est limitée.

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: Il y a une chose sur laquelle nous nous entendons certainement: c'est que la majorité des gens de langue anglaise, il y en a plusieurs qui n'aimeraient pas voir des programmes en français tous les jours. C'est une des raisons que nous n'en avons pas à la radio avant l'érection de nos postes, justement à cause de cela. Là, au moins, ils auraient le choix, s'ils n'aiment pas le programme, de prendre un autre poste. Nous savons pertinemment que Radio-Canada serait certainement le poste le plus approprié pour rendre ce service.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous êtes d'accord que

financièrement parlant, un second poste fondé par l'entreprise privée serait voué à l'échec, ici?

DR. P. E. LaFLECHE: A notre point de vue, surtout parce que le marché ne serait pas assez considérable pour eux.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Dr. LaFleche. We appreciate your coming here.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have now another brief by Collège de Saint-Boniface. We will mark this brief as Exhibit No. 50.

EXHIBIT NO. 50: Brief presented by Le Collège de Saint-Boniface.

SUBMISSION OF LE COLLEGE DE
SAINT-BONIFACE.

APPEARANCES:

M. R.P.S. Valiquette

M. L. Commissaire Turcotte

M. R.P.S. VALIQUETTE, s.j.: Monsieur le président, messieurs les commissaires.

Le Collège de Saint-Boniface est un Collège classique de langue française, semblable à ceux de la province de Québec, mais affilié à l'Université de Manitoba, à laquelle il est lié par de nombreux liens historiques et institutionnels. Il est dirigé par la Compagnie de Jésus depuis 1885. Nous donnons dans l'Appendice I de notre mémoire un bref aperçu historique du Collège de St-Boniface et de ses relations avec l'Université de Manitoba.

Nous sommes voués à l'enseignement des humanités, et nos idéaux sont ceux que défend avec vigueur et à-propos le Rapport Massey (pp. 162 et suivantes). Nous aussi, nous professons que les humanités ne sont pas "une broderie superflue que tissent les arts libéraux, mais bien la trame même de l'esprit. L'étude sérieuse de disciplines aussi essentielles que l'histoire, la philosophie, la religion, la littérature a pour objet ni plus ni moins que d'enseigner à l'étudiant à penser, de former son esprit, de cultiver son jugement et son goût et de lui apprendre à s'exprimer avec précision et clarté. Et nous essayons d'amener nos élèves à tirer eux-mêmes la conclusion: "Que peut-il y avoir de plus pratique?"

Si nous sommes attachés aux valeurs classiques, nous n'en voulons pas moins être modernes. Nous

avons conscience de vivre au siècle de la technique, et c'est pourquoi nous attachons une grande importance à l'enseignement des sciences. Nous savons aussi que nous sommes dans le siècle de la communication et de l'image, d'où le rôle primordial joué par la radio et la télévision. Nous essayons de préparer nos élèves à leur rôle de récepteurs et de producteurs par rapport à ces organismes de la vie moderne.

Dans l'Appendice III, le professeur de théâtre de notre Collège trace le tableau de ce que nous faisons et voulons faire dans les domaines connexes à la radio et à la télévision. Nous reprendrons dans nos recommandations celles qu'il fait en guise de conclusion.

Valeurs que nous croyons essentielles à la radiodiffusion sonore et visuelle, au Canada en général, au Manitoba-français en particulier.

Valeur morale. Il y a un rapport évident entre la morale et toute forme d'éducation. L'éducation populaire par la radio et la télévision échappe encore moins que toute autre à cette exigence, d'autant plus qu'elle pose des problèmes très difficiles à résoudre. Le plus épineux de ces problèmes est constitué par la présence inévitable des enfants à des programmes que nous voudrions destinés aux adultes seulement. Déjà la moralité des programmes pour adultes prête flanc à d'inconciliables divergences de vues. D'après certains l'art doit suggérer la réalité, avec ses crudités inévitables. D'après d'autres, le désir de rencontrer une certaine dose de scènes osées sur l'écran n'est qu'une autre manifestation d'un ~~sexualisme~~ sexualisme inavoué. De toutes façons, quelles que soient nos opinions sur ce point, la présence des enfants exige un effort particulier de

moralité et de pudeur. La juste mesure est très difficile à trouver.

Les seules solutions concrètes que nous ayons à suggérer se ramènent au choix du personnel et à la censure. Que Radio-Canada soit sévère sur la moralité de ceux qui occupent des postes responsables, comme le choix des programmes, la vérification des textes. Que la collaboration avec les organismes de censure provinciaux soit loyale et complète.

Valeur artistique: Les écueils sur ce point sont évidents: d'un côté le grand art avec son hermétisme qui en fait un aliment de choix réservé aux palais délicats de privilégiés. De l'autre, le supposé goût populaire, qui est une absence de bon goût. Heureusement que le juste milieu est possible, et Radio-Canada peut se féliciter d'avoir contribué énormément à répandre le bon goût chez la plus grande partie de la population. Il semble dangereux de prendre comme norme de ce que veut le peuple les opinions sur ce point des agents commerciaux. Dans un grand nombre de discussions récemment, des personnages autorisés nous ont assuré qu'ils se trompent très souvent sur les prétendus goûts populaires. En vérité, nous sommes souvent surpris d'entendre de la part de gens du peuple que nous connaissons qu'ils ont bien aimé tel programme qui semblait pourtant d'un art assez sévère.

Notre appendice IV cite un texte où André Laurendeau discute cette question à propos des enfants.

Le cas de Téléthéâtre est discuté avec beaucoup de pertinence par le même journaliste dans l'Appendice V. Nous approuvons tout ce que l'auteur dit en substance, sauf que nous le trouvons trop sévère. Nous ne voyons pas tant de défauts que cela

dans Téléthéâtre. Nous avouons notre surprise devant certaines critiques adressées à ce programme. C'est certainement la plus belle réalisation de Radio-Canada, et c'est avec un grand regret que nous le verrions tomber.

Valeurs nationales: canadiennes et canadiennes-françaises en particulier. Nous souscrivons sur ce point à ce que dit le rapport de l'Association des Anciens de notre Collège, que nous citons dans l'Appendice II.

Nos recommandations s'appuieront sur les mêmes raisons. Contentons-nous de souligner le bon travail accompli par Radio-Canada sur ce point. Les effets jusqu'ici ont été excellents. Le sentiment canadien et l'unité nationale ne pourront que progresser si l'on continue à avancer dans la direction déjà tracée.

La structure de Radio-Canada. Nous sommes d'avis que les hommes qui ont présidé à la fondation et au fonctionnement de Radio-Canada ont bien compris le rôle qui revenait à cet organisme dans la vie canadienne. Nous les félicitons spécialement d'avoir accepté leurs responsabilités d'éducateurs de la nation canadienne dans les trois domaines sur lesquels nous venons d'insister. Ils ont aussi compris les responsabilités de Radio-Canada envers les petits groupes isolés et les minorités.

Nous crohons que le monopole dont jouit Radio-Canada dans la radiodiffusion lui est essentiel en vue du rôle de nature éducationnel qui lui revient.

Lui enlever une partie de ses attributions pour confier la direction des permis et des ondes à un autre organisme nous semble constituer un danger, car cet organisme pourrait assez facilement subir des

pressions politiques et autres de l'extérieur qui amèneraient à la longue un changement complet de l'esprit qui anime la direction actuelle.

Voici nos recommandations:

Conserver à Radio-Canada son organisation actuelle, avec bureaux provinciaux plus structurés, où les organismes provinciaux d'éducation auraient un droit de représentation permanent.

Le procédé actuel de financement par des taxes sur les appareils à la source semble rationnel. Compenser à même les fonds publics ordinaires plutôt que de trop surcharger ce moyen et rendre l'accès à la télévision trop difficile pour le budget moyen. Par exemple, on suggère que le gouvernement pourrait voter une somme fixe par appareil en usage.

La radio française au Canada. L'étendre jusqu'au Pacifique en s'assurant les services d'un poste pour transmettre le réseau français autour de Vancouver, où se trouvent 40,000 Canadiens-français.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Dans le cas de Vancouver, c'est un poste de radio dont il s'agit?

M. R.P.S. VALIQUETTE: Oui. On reviendra sur la télévision.

Maintenant, aider financièrement les postes français actuellement existants en leur assurant une aide financière en plus des simples programmes, surtout advenant une crise financière qui pourrait les obliger à fermer leurs portes. Car ces postes jouent un rôle dont Radio-Canada partage la responsabilité dans une large mesure.

Accepter le principe qu'il revient à Radio-Canada de procurer le plus tôt possible des programmes de télévision en français aux groupes français de l'Ouest, afin que partout au Canada tout Canadien-

français se sente chez lui et puisse jouir des moyens de culture équivalents à ceux des autres: ceci, sinon dans son entourage immédiat, au moins pas très loin de chez lui; afin aussi que le Canadien-anglais s'habitue partout au fait français et puisse assez facilement se procurer l'avantage, comme un grand nombre en ont manifesté le désir, de profiter de la seconde culture canadienne.

Que l'on envisage dès à présent la possibilité de créer ou encourager, dès que ce sera possible, la création d'un poste français à Saint-Boniface.

Pour le moment, nous serions satisfaits si Radio-Canada:

- a) conservait le programme actuel du dimanche, y inclus Téléthéâtre;
- b) nous procurait, dès qu'un second poste anglais sera fondé à Winnipeg, deux heures de français par jour à la télévision, réparties en périodes de 15 ou 30 minutes au cours de la soirée. Ceci, soit à Radio-Canada seulement, soit en imposant au nouveau poste l'obligation de fournir une heure de français par jour, l'autre étant fournie par Radio-Canada.

Qu'une partie importante des programmes de radio-Canada soit éducationnelle, par exemple, cours de français pour gens de langue anglaise, théâtre, discussions sérieuses.

Que la réalisation locale tant artistique que de pensée, -- v.g. discussions par des gens d'ici sur des problèmes locaux, -- soit encouragée le plus possible; même au risque d'une qualité inférieure.

Que Radio-Canada prenne les moyens de faire l'éducation des parents au sujet de l'usage de la

télévision, surtout par les enfants. Il est constaté que, sur un grand nombre de ceux-ci, la télévision a un effet néfaste.

Qu'il y ait un responsable Canadien-français à Winnipeg pour la direction des programmes en langue française.

Nous appuyons les recommandations faites à l'Appendice III de notre mémoire au sujet des Collèges:

Que Radio-Canada fournisse aux Collèges classiques de la littérature sur les métiers et les professions de la radio et de la télévision.

Que Radio-Canada organise des concours de sketches de radio et de télévision dans les Collèges classiques.

Que Radio-Canada organise à la radio et à la télévision un concours analogue à celui de "Nos futures étoiles", et que l'on accorde des bourses d'étude à Paris aux lauréats de ces concours.

Me deGRANDPRE: Evidemment, Père, les problèmes que vous avez soulevés ont été discutés assez à fond cet après-midi et je serai bien bref. Un aspect qui n'avait pas été touché et que vous touchez, c'est évidemment le point de vue moral. Est-ce que nous devons comprendre ce mémoire comme étant plutôt une forme d'avertissement qu'une plainte sur des sujets bien précis?

M. R.P.S. VALIQUETTE: Je pense que c'est les deux. Sur certains programmes qui ont été présentés il y a eu des discussions aussi bien dans l'Est que dans l'Ouest, et les journaux de Montréal nous ont rapporté quelques discussions. Ici, ces discussions ne se sont pas fait entendre dans les journaux, mais dans le public et les associations il

y a eu des discussions.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Programmes en quelle langue?

M. R.P.S. VALIQUETTE: En français. Il s'agissait de pièces de théâtre et de forums.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous avez des cas spécifiques à nous citer?

M. R.P.S. VALIQUETTE: Moi, je n'en ai pas; je ne sais pas si le Père Jolicoeur en aurait.

REV. PERE C. JOLICOEUR: C'est un mélange de questions de moralité et de questions de bon goût. Ce que nous avons de ce genre-là, "Music Hall", est assez discutable. On se demande parfois si les enfants ne tireraient pas mauvais exemple. Ca frise la question de moralité et de bon goût à la fois.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Le programme français?

M. R.P.S. VALIQUETTE: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Si c'était dirigé uniquement à des adultes, vous n'y verriez pas d'objection?

M. R.P.S. VALIQUETTE: Absolument.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que votre suggestion serait de le retarder à une heure plus tardive?

M. R.P.S. VALIQUETTE: Comme nous disons ici, c'est difficile de résoudre le problème. La seule solution c'est d'avoir des hommes qui sont sûrs sur ce point-là et leur demander de prendre leurs responsabilités vu qu'il faut qu'ils produisent avec les hommes qu'ils ont, et des fois c'est un peu sur la marge; et le "Music Hall", par exemple, il y a beaucoup de ces ballerines qui ont des présentations assez dangereuses et qui ne sont pas des présentations très artistiques, et quand ce sont des danses populaires c'est assez dangereux. Comme vous dites, quand

c'est au moment où les enfants y sont, c'est assez difficile d'accepter cela.

Me deGRANDPRE: A la page 2, vous dites "Nous croyons que le monopole dont jouit Radio-Canada dans la radiodiffusion lui est essentiel en vue du rôle de nature éducationnel qui lui revient". Est-ce que vous distinguez que le monopole est nécessaire dans le domaine éducationnel mais que l'entreprise privée pourrait y trouver sa place dans le domaine divertissement?

M. R.P.S. VALIQUETTE: C'est difficile de trouver des programmes qui ne sont pas du tout éducationnels. La plupart des divertissements ont un sens éducationnel; il y a presque toujours un aspect éducationnel. Si on servait au peuple des programmes de mauvais goût on l'éduquerait dans le mauvais goût. Si on laissait à l'entreprise privée le choix des programmes on a l'impression qu'elle se guiderait uniquement par le coût populaire; et nous croyons que Radio-Canada a un but supérieur. C'est pourquoi nous aimerions que Radio-Canada continue et garde sa supériorité non seulement sur ses propres postes mais aussi sur les programmes des autres postes.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, il y a un autre problème -- et c'est le dernier que je veux aborder -- dans lequel vous dites, à la page 3, sous-paragraphe 8 -- je comprends que vous voulez garder la majeure partie de vos programmes sur une base éducationnelle. Est-ce qu'il n'y a pas de danger que si vous donnez trop d'importance, un moment donné, au point de vue éducationnel vous fassiez fermer l'appareil aux gens qui n'en veulent pas et vous n'obtiendriez pas du tout le rôle que la télévision doit jouer?

M. R.P. JOLICOEUR: Bien, pour la question des postes privés, la partie importante, il ne faudrait pas entendre cela dans le sens de la majorité. Ce que nous avons en vue c'est ce qui adviendrait: que Radio-Canada viendrait en compétition avec un poste privé et que Radio-Canada soit obligée d'entrer en compétition avec un autre poste, et que la tendance de Radio-Canada serait de vouloir faire une compétition sur un plan qui rapporte. Nous voulons que la situation actuelle se maintienne et que Radio-Canada continue à vouloir garder une bonne partie de ses programmes qui a un caractère éducationnel tout en respectant les droits de ses auditeurs.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: A la page 3, article 6, vous dites: "Que l'on envisage dès à présent la possibilité de créer ou encourager, dès que ce sera possible, la création d'un poste français à Saint-Boniface". Croyez-vous que ça soit vraiment réalisable dans l'état actuel de l'économie canadienne?

M. R.P. VALIQUETTE: Je pense que M. Couture et le Dr. LaFlèche ont passablement répondu à la question. Actuellement ça semble difficilement viable. C'est pour cela que nous avons pris une formule qui laisse un échappatoire: "que l'on envisage la possibilité". C'est encore lointain; mais l'idée qui a inspiré ce paragraphe c'est qu'en supposant qu'on introduise de plus en plus de français dans le poste anglais/^{cela}ne nous satisfera pas.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Est-ce que vous ne demandez pas le plus afin d'avoir le moins?

M. R.P. VALIQUETTE: Ce n'est pas impossible.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: D'autre part, dans le cas où un de ces jours un second poste de

télévision est autorisé à Winnipeg et en supposant que cet autre poste soit un poste privé, croyez-vous qu'il soit possible, à ce moment-là, de consacrer un temps plus considérable au poste de Radio-Canada, télévision, à des émissions françaises afin que ce poste privé ne soit pas privé des ressources commerciales possibles?

M. R.P. VALIQUETTE: C'est une bonne question. Il est évident que les marchands, même de langue anglaise, sont intéressés à commanditer des programmes de langue française parce que leur clientèle est de langue française autant que l'autre. Ça reste un problème concret auquel je serais fort embarrassé de répondre parce que c'est un domaine où je suis passablement étranger; c'est de l'administration et je n'y suis pas beaucoup.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: En d'autres termes, un second poste, possiblement recevant des programmes de soutien de Radio-Canada, mais de langue anglaise, de cette façon libérerait le poste actuel en créant de l'espace pour ce poste de Radio-Canada qui pourrait être consacré à des programmes français plus abondants?

M. R.P. VALIQUETTE: Et je crois que ces programmes français pourraient être commandités. Il y a tout de même une clientèle de langue française.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: La plupart de ces programmes étant des programmes de soutien ne rapporteraient rien à Radio-Canada, sauf le cas de la Famille Plouffe qui est commanditée; mais ça passe aussi en anglais. Je crois que ça vous donnerait beaucoup plus de temps que vous en avez actuellement, tout en contentant une partie de l'opinion qui désire un second poste.

M. R.P. VALIQUETTE: C'est fort possible.

INDEX

<u>SUBMISSION OF:</u>	<u>Page</u>
C.K.R.C. WINNIPEG ...	1036
Mr. Clifford Sifton	
Mr. Wm. A. Speers	
THE RETAIL MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION OF CANADA ...	1079
Mr. C.I. Keith, Q.C.	
Mr. D.A. Gilbert	
THE MANITOBA LABOUR PROGRESSIVE PARTY ...	1106
Mr. W.C. Ross	
Mr. R. Pennor	
CANADIAN COSTUMERS ...	1125
Mr. C.I. Keith, Q.C.	
Mr. Ross Malabar	
RADIO SAINT-BONIFACE LIMITEE ...	1144
M. Roland Couture	
RADIO OUEST-FRANCAISE ...	1171
Dr. L.O. Beauchemin	
M. Roland Couture	
L'ASSOCIATION D'EDUCATION DES CANADIENS-FRANCAIS DU MANITOBA ...	1180
Dr. P.E. LaFleche	
LE COLLEGE DE SAINT-BONIFACE ...	1194
Mr. R.P.S. Valiquette	

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
41	Brief of the Red River T.V. Association	1027
42	List of members of the Red River T.V. Association	1028
43	Brief presented by Station C.K.R.C. Winnipeg	1036
44	Brief of the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada	1079
45	Brief filed by Manitoba Labour Progressive Party	1106
46	Brief filed by Canadian Costumers	1125
47	Brief presented by Radio-Saint-Boniface Limitee	1144
48	Brief submitted by Radio-Ouest-Francaise	1171
49	Brief submitted by l'Association d'Education des Canadiens-Francais du Manitoba	1179
50	Brief submitted by Le College de Saint-Boniface	1193

ROYAL COMMISSION
ON
BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

WINNIPEG, MAN.

MAY 9, 1956

V. 8

Winnipeg, Manitoba,
May 9, 1956.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will come to order now.

The first brief is to be presented by Le Cercle
Moliere de Saint-Boniface, by Mr. Denis Belair and
Mr. R. Trudel. We will mark this brief as Exhibit
No. 51.

EXHIBIT NO. 51: Brief submitted by Le Cercle
Moliere de St-Boniface.

SUBMISSION OF LE CERCLE MOLIERE DE
ST-BONIFACE.

APPEARANCES:

M. Denis Belair

M. DENIS BELAIR: Monsieur le président, messieurs les commissaires. Le manque total de théâtre professionnel de langue française dans cette région de l'Ouest a sans doute été à l'origine de l'éclosion de plusieurs sociétés d'amateurs, dont le Cercle Molière de Saint-Boniface. Fondé en 1925, c'est un des cercles dramatiques les plus anciens au Canada. Depuis trente-et-un ans, il donne une ou deux grandes représentations annuellement et plusieurs pièces en un acte ou des lectures de pièces dans ses réunions mensuelles, ou sous les auspices d'autres sociétés culturelles ou même de bienfaisance. Il s'est aussi quelquefois produit à la radio (CKSB et Radio-Canada). Il a participé au Festival National d'Art Dramatique (concours régional et final) douze fois depuis 1934, y remportant vingt-six récompenses, ce qui constitue un beau record et donne une preuve du niveau élevé de ses représentations. Son influence parmi la jeunesse intéressée au théâtre est aussi appréciée tant parmi la population de langue anglaise que parmi celle de langue française. Il offre annuellement des prix dans des concours de diction et de français organisés dans les écoles et prête souvent son assistance dans l'organisation et le montage de soirées théâtrales présentées par des groupes de jeunes amateurs ou des maisons d'éducation. Sa tenue et son exemple ont su lui gagner le respect et la confiance de toute la popula-

tion manitobaine et de celle de langue française en particulier.

Le Cercle Molière est donc en mesure de donner un aperçu sur l'ensemble des réactions du public vis-à-vis des programmes que nous offre Radio-Canada à la radio et la télévision, ainsi que d'émettre une opinion au sujet de certaines modifications ou revendications qu'il estime nécessaires. En exprimant cette opinion, il espère coopérer de la façon la plus entière et la plus honnête avec la Commission Royale d'Enquête dans le but qu'elle s'est assigné.

Voici les points sur lesquels notre comité désire attirer tout spécialement l'attention de messieurs les membres de la Commission d'enquête:

Télévision et radio: Les postes de radio et de télévision se multipliant à travers le Canada, il se crée un besoin plus étendu et plus varié de programmes anglais et français sur leurs réseaux. De ce fait, il serait nécessaire que chaque grand centre de l'Ouest puisse produire des programmes de théâtre choisis pour le besoin et le goût de la population, sans toutefois négliger le côté artistique et culturel. Ces programmes devraient être dirigés et réalisés par des directeurs et techniciens locaux, et auxquels participeraient des artistes dramatiques de la région. Ici, à Winnipeg et à Saint-Boniface, bon nombre de ces artistes sont parfaitement bilingues.

Le poste de Radio-Canada à Winnipeg est certainement bien équipé à tous points de vue: technique et matériel, initiative et talents, pour pouvoir offrir aux téléspectateurs et aux auditeurs des programmes intéressants, d'un niveau respectable, se présentant de façon très satisfaisante à côté de certaines émissions qui nous viennent de l'Est. Sans

vouloir prétendre à la qualité de quelques-unes de ces émissions, celles de Montréal surtout, nous estimons qu'il est cependant possible de réaliser à Winnipeg des programmes qui seraient sûrement goûtés de la population du Manitoba et des autres provinces de l'Ouest: cette population a en commun certains problèmes qui n'existent pas dans l'Est, ou tout au moins pas à la même échelle: pour n'en mentionner qu'un, la diversité des groupes ethniques.

Dans un pays aussi vaste que le Canada, une centralisation trop excessive ne se justifie pas. Aujourd'hui, la grande majorité des programmes de télévision est réalisée à Montréal et à Toronto. Cela n'est pas équitable. Les artistes de talent des autres régions sont contraints de s'expatrier et de se diriger vers ces deux centres de production s'ils veulent se faire valoir. Le résultat de tout ceci, c'est que Winnipeg, Vancouver et les autres grands centres se vident de plus en plus de leurs artistes les plus intéressants, et leurs postes de télévision, qui devraient produire, deviennent ni plus ni moins que des postes de relais. Winnipeg aurait un avantage bien net tant en radio qu'en télévision, puisqu'il offre un choix d'éléments nécessaires à la réalisation de programmes dans les deux langues officielles du pays.

Programme de télévision française: Dès les débuts de la télévision à Winnipeg, Radio-Canada a reconnu le fait français au Manitoba. La Société d'état a inscrit deux heures de français par semaine à son horaire: nous considérons cependant que c'est insuffisant. Il nous semble que la proportion de programmes en langue française devrait être en rapport avec le pourcentage de la population, soit sept pourcent dans la province, et certainement plus dans

le rayonnement du poste de Winnipeg. Alors, nous aurions droit à cinq heures de français par semaine à Winnipeg. En admettant que "L'Heure du Concert", un programme où la présentation est bilingue, serait considérée comme une émission de langue française, nous aurions tout de même le droit de réclamer deux heures de plus. Nous y reviendrons dans notre prochain paragraphe.

Les deux heures de français que l'on nous présentait au début consistaient en des films français très anciens et souvent médiocres. Depuis un an, on y a substitué des programmes de réalisation canadienne, interprétés par des artistes canadiens. C'est une amélioration qui est appréciée de la grande majorité des téléspectateurs. Cependant, il y aurait plus à faire. On devrait consacrer une demi-heure de ce bloc français à la réalisation locale, et c'est ce que nous réclamons.

Programmes éducatifs: Une série de programmes destinés aux enfants pourrait fort bien et grandement aider les éducateurs à développer et à élever le goût de nos écoliers, à les intéresser à l'histoire de leur pays, de leur province, par de courtes réalisations dramatiques. Tous les écoliers en général, mais surtout ceux de langue française ne tireraient-ils pas le plus grand profit de la lecture mimée d'une fable de La Fontaine, par exemple? Et pour ceux des grades supérieurs, voir à l'écran de la télévision des oeuvres classiques, inscrites à leur programme scolaire, n'est-ce pas encore un moyen excellent de mieux connaître la littérature française et de mieux comprendre Molière, Marivaux, Musset, Daudet, etc. Les leçons d'histoire naturelle, démonstrations de petits travaux d'artisanat, etc.,

tout cela présenté en jeu dramatique mériterait une place de toute première importance à la télévision puisqu'il s'agit de l'éducation de nos jeunes Canadiens.

Chaque jour, le poste local de télévision consacre une heure et demie aux programmes pour les jeunes. Nous recommandons qu'un quart d'heure de ce bloc d'émissions soit consacré au français. En prenant au hasard l'horaire du réseau français de la télévision de Radio-Canada, nous relevons les titres suivants de programmes pour enfants qui pourraient être incorporés dans l'horaire du poste local : "L'ami des jeunes", "Autour du Monde", "Bricolage", "La boîte aux couleurs", "La porte du ciel". Ces programmes seraient d'un intérêt tout particulier aux jeunes auditeurs de langue française mais également aux jeunes auditeurs de langue anglaise. Ce genre de programmation leur permettrait de mettre en pratique les leçons de français qu'ils apprennent dans les écoles du Manitoba depuis la quatrième année.

Etablissement d'un deuxième poste de télévision. Stations privées de télévision.

Ces stations privées devraient être pour bon nombre d'années à venir, contrôlées par Radio-Canada. Il est à craindre que leur développement dans certains centres et leur influence soient contraires au but poursuivi par la radio et la télévision d'état. Trop de programmes étrangers, non seulement de qualité médiocre, mais souvent de mauvais goût, envahiraient le pays. Eloignons-les le plus possible et le plus longtemps possible. Nous avons au

Canada tout ce qui est nécessaire pour faire aussi bien qu'ailleurs. Il suffit de s'en servir.

Nous savons fort bien que la Société Radio-Canada s'est tracé un programme progressif en télévision et qu'on en est encore à la première étape. Il ne saurait donc être question d'un deuxième poste, ou plutôt d'un deuxième canal de télévision dans notre arrondissement pour le moment. C'est d'ailleurs la raison de nos réclamations précédentes. Cependant, lorsqu'il s'agira d'émettre un deuxième permis à Winnipeg, nous espérons qu'il sera contrôlé par Radio-Canada, même s'il devait être exploité par des intérêts privés, et nous souhaitons que ce permis soit émis en autant que l'exploiteur saura reconnaître ses obligations vis-à-vis la minorité française du rayonnement.

Programmes de radiodiffusion: Pour les mêmes raisons citées pour la télévision, nous sommes d'opinion que certains programmes de Radio-Canada sont d'un choix discutable. Niveau trop élevé pour certains: exemple: "Radio-Collège". Ils ne satisfont et n'intéressent qu'une faible minorité des auditeurs. D'autre part, il importe de ne pas se rendre à un goût trop prononcé chez nos gens pour le genre trop populaire du terroir. Il faudrait établir un équilibre sain, simple et de bon goût.

Conclusion. Nous insistons sur la nécessité immédiate de considérer attentivement la décentralisation de la réalisation des programmes, et l'augmentation du nombre d'heures consacrées aux émissions de langue française télévisées de

Winnipeg:

Afin de mieux se conformer aux besoins d'une population dont les goûts et l'esprit sont assez différents de ceux de la population de l'Est tout en demeurant purement Canadiens;

Afin de permettre à la population de l'Est et de l'Ouest du pays de mieux se connaître, et par là, de s'apprécier davantage;

Afin d'accorder dans la réalisation locale aux acteurs de langue française (professionnels ou amateurs) la juste place qu'ils ont largement gagnée en contribuant à l'expansion de l'art dramatique dans l'Ouest. Le bilinguisme est un aspect intéressant du visage de notre pays. Encore faut-il qu'il s'affirme dans toutes les régions avec la même acuité.

Pour permettre à la Société Radio-Canada de mettre ces recommandations à exécution, nous prions Messieurs les Membres de la Commission d'Enquête, de bien vouloir proposer que les octrois nécessaires soient versés à la Société Radio-Canada pour assurer non seulement l'amélioration, mais aussi la croissance de cet organisme d'état.

Nous vous prions, messieurs, d'agréer l'expression de nos vœux les plus sincères pour mener à bonne fin l'enquête que vous poursuivez et nous vous assurons de notre entière collaboration.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
It was a most interesting brief. Mr. deGrandpré, have you any questions?

Me deGRANDPRE: Yes, just a few,
Mr. Chairman.

Me deGRANDPRE: Un des buts ou une des recommandations de votre mémoire c'est de décentraliser la réalisation des programmes de façon à donner une part plus grande à la réalisation locale. Maintenant, je sais que c'est un sujet sur lequel les opinions sont assez partagées, non pas quant au principe mais quant à la façon pratique d'y voir, étant donné le nombre restreint de talents créateurs pour réaliser.

Ici, à Winnipeg, est-ce que vous seriez capables de réaliser pendant 52 semaines, une heure ou une demi-heure de programmes qui seraient des programmes canadiens et réalisés par des Canadiens?

M. BELAIR: Nous croyons que nous avons les talents, ici, dans le domaine de la réalisation, dans le domaine des acteurs, des comédiens, pour avoir soin d'une telle chose. Peut-être que pour débiter une heure serait un peu fort; mais je vois bien une demi-heure par semaine.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous ne voyez pas de difficultés pour une demi-heure par semaine?

M. BELAIR: Non, peut-être pour une heure.

Me deGRANDPRE: Tant au point de vue création qu'au point de vue des acteurs?

M. BELAIR: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Quant à votre Cercle Molière en particulier, il me semble que je vous ai déjà vus à la télévision, à Montréal. Est-ce que vous n'avez pas eu occasion de réaliser quelque chose qui a été produit sur le réseau français?

M. BELAIR: Non.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous seriez

en mesure, et si oui, à combien de reprises par année -- je constate que vous êtes des amateurs -- à combien de reprises par année seriez-vous en mesure de produire une production sur une base nationale?

M. BELAIR: Cette question-là n'a pas été mise tout à fait à l'étude, car nous aimerions débiter avec ce que nous pourrions faire; mais je crois que nous sommes en mesure, sur une base nationale, de donner une série de programmes. Maintenant, vous me posez une question. Est-ce qu'on pourrait y aller une fois le mois? C'est assez difficile, sur une base nationale. J'ose dire, sur une base nationale, je pense bien que nous pourrions bien y arriver une fois par mois. Monsieur Trudel, auriez-vous une opinion là-dessus?

M. TRUDEL: Je crois que oui; ça dépend de la place où on peut répéter. On est toujours embêté pour répéter nos pièces. Le problème serait plutôt du côté technique que la production de la pièce même; mais je crois que nous avons chez nous assez de talents pour donner au moins une pièce par mois, sur une base nationale.

Me deGRANDPRE: Une pièce d'une heure ou d'une demi-heure?

M. TRUDEL: J'aimerais mieux commencer par une demi-heure.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous dites qu'au point de vue technique Radio-Canada ne serait peut-être pas équipé pour réaliser sur place la production d'un programme national?

M. TRUDEL: Je dis cela parce qu'ici il n'y a pas de pièces données à la télévision de Radio-Canada, même en anglais; et ils ont beaucoup

de talents anglais, ici, pour donner une pièce en anglais, mais jusqu'à date il n'y en a pas eu. D'après ce que je peux voir, il y a manque d'espace à Radio-Canada pour répéter les pièces.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Diriez-vous qu'il n'y a pas de studios pour permettre les répétitions et le passage en ondes?

M. TRUDEL: Non.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: De sorte qu'il y a beaucoup de talents de langue anglaise qui n'ont pas les moyens de se manifester?

M. TRUDEL: Justement.

M. BELAIR: La question de télévision, quant aux studios, je ne suis pas au courant; mais on nous rapporte qu'ils sont à l'étroit.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Est-ce qu'il existe un cercle de langue anglaise avec lequel vous êtes en collaboration?

M. BELAIR: Oui.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Comme le théâtre du Nouveau Monde, à Montréal, qui parfois, monte une pièce en anglais?

M. BELAIR: Il y a, à Winnipeg, le Winnipeg Little Theatre avec lequel nous nous entendons très bien. Ils montent des pièces en anglais, et nous en français.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Le faites-vous dans une salle commune?

M. TRUDEL: Non, nous n'avons pas les moyens de le faire. Il faut louer le Playhouse qui appartient à la Ville de Winnipeg. Nos camarades de langue anglaise font la même chose. Ils ont plus d'opportunité pour donner leurs pièces

parce qu'ils ont un plus grand auditoire pour les aider à défrayer les dépenses. Ils montent quatre pièces par années au Playhouse; et le coût élevé du loyer du Playhouse ne permet pas à notre Cercle Molière de présenter tant de pièces.

MR. STEWART: I am sorry I don't speak French. Maybe some people say I don't speak English either. At the bottom of the first page you say there that today the great majority of programmes in television are produced in Montreal and Toronto. I think probably we could ascribe that to the fact that television has not spread itself all over Canada for the time being. Would that be a fair statement? I have that thought in mind by reason of the fact that on the radio I have heard quite a number of programmes in Toronto that had their origin in Winnipeg, so that in radio I have the thought in mind, rightly or otherwise, they are broadcast from here nationally. Would you think that would come about also in television as the network expands?

MR. TRUDEL: I imagine so, sir. That is exactly what we are asking for, and want to see.

MR. STEWART: Is that due to the fact that the television network has not spread throughout Canada yet?

MR. TRUDEL: Rightfully so.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps Mr. Stewart's question goes for the next question in your brief: "ce n'est pas équitable". It is really not a question.

MR. TRUDEL: As at present I would say it is not equitable.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the reasons for what

Mr. Stewart is suggesting were not based on equity or lack of it? It was based on the practicality in the early stages of the development.

MR. TRUDEL: Right.

MR. STEWART: Are your programs that originate in the French language in Winnipeg broadcast throughout the French network in Quebec? Radio, I mean. Are they broadcast originally here and transmitted over the French network in Quebec?

MR. TRUDEL: In some cases, yes, but they are far and few between.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for that brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next is a brief being presented on behalf of L'Association des Anciens Elèves du Collège de Saint-Boniface. I am not exactly certain as to who is to present it.

MR. LOUIS DENISET: My name is Louis Deniset and I am with Mr. Maurice Miron. As a matter of fact I didn't have the privilege of drawing this brief but I did have the opportunity of sitting in at some sessions that led up to that, and I understand the final brief was only submitted yesterday, while it was sent some time ago.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will just get this straight. We will first mark this as Exhibit 52.

EXHIBIT No. 52: Brief submitted by L'Association des Anciens Elèves du Collège de St-Boniface.

SUBMISSION OF L'ASSOCIATION DES ANCIENS
ELEVES DU COLLEGE DE SAINT-BONIFACE

APPEARANCES:

M. Louis Deniset

M. Maurice Miron

M. LOUIS DENISET: Monsieur le président,
messieurs les membres de la Commission. L'Association
des Anciens Elèves du Collège de Saint-Boniface est
un organisme qui cherche à tenir groupés autour de
leur Alma Mater tous ceux qui ont fait leurs études
ou une parties de leurs études au Collège. Depuis
1885, le nombre de ces Anciens, comme nous les
appelons, s'élève à près de 6,000. Sur ce nombre,
nous estimons que 4,500 vivent encore. Ils sont
dispresés d'un bout à l'autre du Canada, voire de
l'univers, puisque nous comptons à l'étranger
quelques employés aux affaires extérieures et une
équipe imposante de missionnaires. Environ 500 de
nos Anciens sont des diplômés de l'Université de
Manitoba. Notons en passant que notre Collège est
l'un des quatre collèges fondateurs de cette
université et que, depuis la fondation, il lui est
toujours resté affilié. A part nos gradués, plus de
400 de nos Anciens ont suivi le cours d'Humanités.
Notre association a fourni, à l'heure actuelle, 325
prêtres, dont 2 archevêques et 6 évêques, 75 médecins,
40 avocats, 5 juges et un minimum de 25 ingénieurs.
Plusieurs de nos membres sont devenus des institu-
teurs de marque. Plus nombreux encore sont ceux
qui se sont engagés dans les diverses carrières
commerciales et dans le fonctionnarisme. Dans le
monde de la radio et de la télévision, nous sommes

fort bien représentés, En effet, trois des quatre gérants des postes français de l'ouest canadien appartiennent à notre association et on peut en dire autant de tout le personnel masculin de CKSB de Saint-Boniface, y compris les techniciens. Dans la province de Québec, le premier annonceur à CBFT, Montréal, Henri Bergeron, est un de nos membres les plus fidèles. M. Bergeron fut, au Canada, le premier annonceur bilingue à la télévision. On sait qu'il a été proclamé en 1955 l'annonceur le plus populaire de l'année. Nous sommes fiers aussi des deux MM. Goulet, bien connus à Montréal comme annonceurs et réalisateurs à la radio, et de plusieurs autres dont il serait trop long de dresser la liste.

C'est vous dire que notre Association marque bien le fait canadien. Elle souligne ce fait d'autant que, d'après nos calculs, environ 10 pour cent des nôtres exercent leur carrière ou leur métier en Saskatchewan, 8 pour cent aux Etats-Unis (jadis, plusieurs élèves venaient d'outre-frontière), plus de 8 pour cent en Ontario, 6 pour cent dans le Québec et 10 pour cent en Alberta et Colombie canadienne.

Notre association reste en contact avec 1500 anciens élèves, distribués géographiquement et socialement à peu près selon les proportions ci-haut mentionnées. Quant aux membres du clergé et aux professionnels, nos membres d'emblée les plus influents, nous les atteignons presque tous.

Notre association a conscience d'être un des seuls organismes qui, au Manitoba, groupent et représentent le public instruit comme tel. Aussi,

en plus de continuer chez ses membres le développement intellectuel, amorcé au Collège, elle étend son rayonnement jusqu'à servir d'intermédiaire entre le grand public et notre Collège universitaire. C'est en quelque sorte un service d'extension de notre Collège. De là vient que le grand public lui doit plusieurs initiatives d'ordre nettement social et éducatif. Nous voulons toutefois que ce rôle reste secondaire, car nous invitons avant tout nos Anciens à bien s'acquitter de leurs fonctions, soit de membres actifs, soit d'animateurs et de chefs, dans les autres organismes franco-manitobains, manitobains ou canadiens.

L'association des Anciens forme une démocratie. Elle a un comité exécutif de 15 membres élus chaque année. Ce comité se réunit tous les mois. Il voit à la publication d'un journal dont la formule et la parution varient selon les ressources financières et humaines. Il invite aussi tous les Anciens et leurs épouses à se réunir au Collège une fois le mois et leur présente, à cette occasion, un programme religieux, suivi d'un autre programme à caractère social et intellectuel. Le programme intellectuel porte d'ordinaire sur des sujets d'actualité: habitation, cinéma, organisation des loisirs, la loi des liqueurs, urbanisme, etc., C'est au cours de ces réunions que nous avons affronté le problème de la radio et de la télévision. Un sous-comité, composé de membres sérieux et intéressés, avait, au préalable, été chargé d'étudier les divers aspects de la question de façon à pouvoir diriger la discussion et lui faire produire d'excellents résultats. Le rapport que

nous soumettons dans les pages qui suivent est le fruit de cette étude, et son contenu a été approuvé à l'unanimité lors de la réunion du 8 avril dernier. Il reflète donc, on ne peut mieux, la pensée et l'espoir de l'Association des Anciens.

Les réalisations que nous venons de souligner relèvent d'un comité permanent de développement intellectuel. Ce comité a à son crédit bien d'autres initiatives d'ordre culturel: cours d'orientation professionnelle, débats publics, forums et que sais-je? Ce printemps, il a organisé en faveur du grand public une série de huit cours d'histoire du Canada. Trois de ces cours ont été donnés et l'assistance moyenne a été de 200 personnes, et nous avons lieu de croire que le nombre d'auditeurs augmentera à chaque cours.

L'Association des Anciens possède aussi un comité d'art dramatique. Les Anciens se sont toujours intéressés au théâtre. En 1953, la troupe des Anciens a participé au festival régional et a remporté le premier prix. Invitée au festival national, on lui a alloué le trophée de la meilleure troupe française.

Qu'on nous excuse de cette longue présentation. Nous l'avons jugée nécessaire pour deux raisons. D'abord, dissiper chez les membres de la Commission Royale un préjugé bien naturel: celui de considérer notre Association des Anciens sur le même pied que la plupart des associations des anciens qui existent dans les Collèges de l'Est, et qui se résument à une réunion par année où l'on échange des amitiés. Puis, faire ressortir les points de ressemblance entre l'idéal que nous poursuivons et

celui de l'organisme dont vous avez à étudier le but et le fonctionnement. Radio et télévision nous touchent de près.

Mieux que nous, vous connaissez l'importance de la radiodiffusion sonore et visuelle dans la vie moderne. La télévision surtout semble appelée à jouer un rôle de premier plan. Bon gré mal gré, nous allons vers une civilisation de l'image. Avantages et inconvénients sautent aux yeux. Qu'on soit pour ou contre, rien n'y fera, la radio et la télévision n'en continueront pas moins d'envahir nos vies personnelles. Tous les secteurs de notre vie en seront marqués, Sur les plans culturel, national et social, nous verrons et entendrons des choses qui influenceront nos actions et détermineront l'orientation de la vie de nos institutions.

C'est dire que la radio et la télévision ont une portée éducationnelle de première importance. Elles peuvent jouer un rôle utile ou néfaste, tant chez les enfants que chez les adultes, dans notre vie canadienne, canadienne-française, manitobaine ou franco-manitobaine. C'est à ce titre d'abord que l'Association des Anciens est intéressée à l'objet de cette enquête. La profession aussi l'intéresse, parce qu'elle voit plusieurs de ses jeunes membres attirés vers cette carrière et désireux d'y consacrer leur vie.

Qui doit contrôler la radiodiffusion? Conséquence de son rôle éducationnel. Quand nous examinons l'histoire de la radiodiffusion au Canada, nous sommes frappés par le sens de responsabilité dont ont fait preuve tant les hommes politiques qui ont eu à prendre l'initiative de la création des

organismes de direction de la radio d'abord, puis de la télévision, que les hommes de haute valeur culturelle et morale à qui on a confié l'exécution concrète des décisions prises. Ce sens des responsabilités uni à un sens démocratique éclairé, a produit un système d'organisation de la radio et de la télévision qui fait l'admiration d'un grand nombre d'observateurs de pays étrangers. Il réussit à assurer la collaboration étroite des organismes publics et privés afin de réaliser les objectifs suivants - dont nous n'avons en main que le texte anglais: "Its general aims must be: to provide the best possible national service; to develop Canadian programs and to bring in suitable programs from other countries; to make the service available to all the Canadians that can possibly be reached, and to bring to all Canadians as nearly as possible the same, or the same quality, and amount of service... The activities of the national system are shaped to these ends: to add to the variety and richness of the life of people in all parts of Canada and in all walks of life; to offer broadcasting of value and pleasure to them; to maintain a flow of information and ideas throughout the country; to promote national understanding and the better knowledge of each other among the regions of Canada and between Canadians of the two languages; to assist the working of our democratic society in providing for fair and free national interchange of opinion; to promote the development of the artistic and intellectual abilities of Canadians and their appreciation of other Canadians; to provide a natural means of expression for Canadian thought and feelings in all

main spheres; to express and reflect the variety in origin and ways of thinking and tastes of Canadians, under one overall Canadian spirit." Paroles de M. Dunton, président du Bureau des Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada devant la Commission Massey, en 1951.

Nous tenons à féliciter et remercier nos hommes politiques et les directeurs de Radio-Canada pour avoir si bien compris leur devoir, spécialement pour n'avoir pas permis que ce soit les intérêts commerciaux qui exercent leur tyrannie dans un secteur si important de la vie culturelle canadienne.

Cependant nous n'irons pas jusqu'à affirmer que tout soit parfait à Radio-Canada. Il y a place pour beaucoup d'améliorations à la radio et à la télévision. Les directeurs eux-mêmes sont sans doute les premiers à le reconnaître. C'est pour les assurer de tout notre appui moral que nous indiquons dans nos recommandations, à la fin de notre rapport, quelques points sur lesquels nous voudrions qu'ils fassent porter leurs efforts.

Nous donnons notre entier appui moral à Radio-Canada spécialement dans la poursuite des objectifs suivants: culture authentique et divertissement sain accessible à tous les Canadiens; Caractère typiquement canadien de la culture présentée, d'où: limitation du recours à l'étranger et encouragement à la réalisation canadienne.

L'utilisation que fait Radio-Canada de l'initiative privée pour lui aider à assurer un service plus complet et plus varié nous semble inspirée d'un sens démocratique remarquable et constitue une réponse pleinement satisfaisante aux accusations de tyrannie culturelle que l'on

lance dans certains milieux contre le monopole de Radio-Canada.

Nous tenons à souligner le rôle compensateur que, dès le début, les organisateurs de Radio-Canada ont voulu donner à cet organisme, concernant les régions et les groupes plus isolés, là où l'initiative privée ne peut suffire à assurer un service convenable. Les efforts de Radio-Canada en ce sens ont été couronnés de succès, à la radio surtout, puisque, pratiquement, aucune région canadienne habitée n'est privée des services d'un poste qu'un appareil ordinaire puisse capter. Pour ce qui est de la télévision, les efforts accomplis pour étendre le service au plus grand nombre de Canadiens possible ont été remarqués et cités en exemple dans les pays étrangers.

Nous sommes pleinement d'accord avec le rapport Massey pour soutenir qu'aucun changement important ne doit être fait dans la structure actuelle de Radio-Canada. Il nous semble qu'aucune autre formule ne puisse répondre aussi bien aux fonctions qu'accomplit ou que doit accomplir l'organisme directeur de la radio au Canada.

L'élément de base de cet organisme est d'être un monopole de l'état canadien, qui, en plus de ses propres services, contrôle et utilise le plus et le mieux possible les organismes privés. Radio-Canada doit rester un monopole à direction unique, responsable à la fois des aspects administratifs et culturels de la radio et de la télévision. La justification fondamentale de ce monopole repose sur le fait que cet organisme remplit les fonctions d'un véritable ministère d'éducation populaire.

On ne laisse pas l'éducation inconsidérément entre les mains d'intérêts commerciaux. Or, enlever le contrôle des permis et des ondes à Radio-Canada, c'est laisser plus de liberté aux intérêts commerciaux.

Quelques changements secondaires seraient peut-être désirables: augmenter le nombre des directeurs afin qu'ils représentent plus d'éléments de la population; structurer davantage les organismes provinciaux en y assurant une influence provinciale plus considérable dans le domaine culturel. Cette dernière modification permettrait à Radio-Canada de respecter davantage l'esprit de la constitution canadienne qui accorde aux provinces une primauté dans l'ordre culturel.

Les Canadiens-français du Manitoba, la radio et la télévision. Les Canadiens-français du Manitoba forment un groupe culturel organisé qui veut vivre et s'épanouir au Manitoba. Comme tout autre groupe, il a besoin de toutes les institutions éducationnelles et autres pour s'assurer une vie qui ne soit inférieure en rien. En particulier, nous avons besoin de tous les moyens modernes d'enrichissement. Nous croyons que nous pouvons vivre en plénitude notre vie de Canadiens français au Manitoba, sans nous trouver dans la nécessité de nous exiler, pour jouir des institutions nécessaires à notre vie culturelle et nationale, avec toute la vigueur et la santé qu'elle possède ailleurs.

A côté de nos institutions éducationnelles, que nous maintenons vivantes et fortes, à prix de sacrifices, parce que les ministères provinciaux refusent de nous aider, nous avons besoin de la radio et de la télévision. Déjà nous avons la radio.

Nous remercions Radio-Canada de ce qu'elle fait pour nous apporter le réseau français, et nous la félicitons pour la qualité qu'elle donne aux programmes de ce réseau. C'est beaucoup, mais nous osons demander encore un peu.

Nous appuyons nos demandes sur les considérations suivantes: Radio-Canada s'est fixée dès le début comme objectif de promouvoir l'unité canadienne et le sentiment canadien. Nous croyons essentiel au sentiment canadien que les Canadiens anglais soient habitués au fait français, tout comme les Canadiens français doivent se familiariser avec le fait anglais au Canada. Nous croyons essentiel au sentiment canadien que tout Canadien de langue française puisse se dire chez lui partout au Canada, que dans toutes les provinces du Canada il puisse se dire: "J'ai ici, pas trop loin d'ici, ce qu'il me faut pour vivre normalement ma vie de Canadien français."

D'autre part, ce fut toujours aussi un des buts de Radio-Canada de jouer un rôle compensateur envers les groupes trop isolés pour faire vivre commercialement un poste. Il nous semble que cette politique fort rationnelle trouve un champ d'application tout désigné lorsqu'il s'agit de répondre, dans le domaine de la radio et de la télévision, aux besoins des groupes canadiens français des régions éloignées de la province de Québec. On ne pourrait donner de preuve plus convaincante d'une volonté d'unité nationale dans le respect et l'amour d'une dualité culturelle d'un bout à l'autre du pays. Notre expérience de la radio au Manitoba nous prouve à l'évidence que c'est là le désir réel des meilleurs éléments parmi nos concitoyens de langue anglaise. Ils écoutent leur poste français, ils le veulent et l'aiment.

Ce que nous attendons de Radio-Canada:

Que Radio-Canada garde substantiellement sa structure actuelle.

Pour la radio: Que Radio-Canada étende ses services français jusqu'au Pacifique en créant un poste autour de Vancouver.

Aide financièrement les postes existant actuellement, et n'en laisse aucun fermer ses portes pour raisons financières. Ces postes remplissent une fonction que Radio-Canada se doit de maintenir.

Pour la télévision:

Admettre le principe qu'il revient à Radio-Canada de faire tout en son pouvoir pour répondre à nos besoins, touchant la télévision.

Si la chose était possible, dans un avenir plus ou moins lointain, un poste français à Saint-Boniface, transmettant les programmes du réseau français aux Canadiens français et anglais de la région.

Actuellement, maintenir le téléthéâtre du dimanche. En plus, nous procurer l'équivalent d'une heure environ par jour sur le poste CBWT, en le distribuant par quarts d'heure ou demi-heures, par exemple, cours de français et programmes récréatifs.

Dès qu'un second poste anglais aura été construit à Winnipeg, nous accorder deux heures de français par jour, distribuées par périodes de 15 ou 30 minutes, soit entièrement à Radio-Canada, soit en exigeant une heure de français tous les jours du poste privé, l'autre étant fournie par Radio-Canada.

Radio-Canada fournirait gratuitement ce service au poste privé, qui pourrait le faire commanditer localement.

Que Radio-Canada se montre plus exigeante au

point de vue moral, qu'elle facilite le travail des bureaux de censure provinciaux afin d'empêcher l'immoralité de se glisser dans certains programmes.

Que tout en accordant une véritable liberté d'opinion dans certaines limites, l'on exerce un contrôle raisonnable mais efficace sur les idées émises à Radio-Canada, empêchant certains éléments d'utiliser ses ondes comme tribune pour propager des idées subversives ou dangereuses, heurtant parfois le sentiment religieux des Canadiens.

Que Radio-Canada ne se finance que partiellement par des taxes sur les appareils. Que l'on puise plutôt aux fonds publics ordinaires.

THE CHAIRMAN: We appreciate the work that has gone into this, quite obviously. I have one question I would like to ask you about on page 4 at the top:

In the second paragraph I think you are saying that the number of the Governors of the C.B.C. should be increased to give a representation to all the various elements of the population. Am I right in thinking that this is referring to the numbers of the Board of Governors?

M. LOUIS DENISET: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you thought of the problem that does exist in a country of the size of Canada where you have Governors scattered all across the country, the sheer problem of getting to meetings frequently? You increase the number and, of course, you increase the problem.

M. LOUIS DENISET: Perhaps the problem can be solved by having sort of a body of Councils that would meet only perhaps twice a year; retain the present structure but add some councils from all over Canada who would come in, say, twice a year.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean sort of advisory councils?

M. LOUIS DENISET: Yes, advisory councils.

THE CHAIRMAN: Because there is a definite problem here, particularly where the members of the Board of Governors are not full time people, of having them give a sufficient number of days for travelling and attending to the work.

M. LOUIS DENISET: Yes, that is quite true.

Me deGRANDPRE: Les recommandations qu'on trouve à la page 5 ont été à peu près toutes discutées à fond, hier, avec le représentant de Radio-Ouest-Française, et avec M. Couture, le gérant du poste de St-Boniface. Il y a un seul point sur lequel je voudrais revenir: c'est celui qui apparaît à la page 4, tout de suite du paragraphe, la partie qui est soulignée: "Radio-Canada doit rester un monopole à direction unique". Qu'est-ce que vous entendez exactement par cela que Radio-Canada doit rester un monopole à direction unique?

M. LOUIS DENISET: Nous procédons tout d'abord du fait que la télévision a une telle importance éducationnelle pour nos enfants. Nos enfants, des fois, passent plusieurs heures devant la télévision, des fois plus d'heures qu'en classe, si bien que la télévision peut avoir une influence sur nos enfants peut-être plus grande que la maîtresse d'école. Alors, qui voudrait suggérer que le maître d'école devrait être soumis à des intérêts commerciaux? La question ne se pose même pas. Là où nous voulons en venir: il faut que Radio-Canada puisse conserver un monopole sur tout ce qui se passe à la télévision, pour empêcher que les gens qui ne songent qu'à faire de l'argent puissent présenter n'importe quel programme qui pourrait

être néfaste au point de vue éducationnel.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je vois votre point de vue, mais je me demande s'il n'y a pas quelque chose de plus.

Me deGRANDPRE: N'auriez-vous pas le même but en disant "administratif" avec les mots "à direction unique"?

M. LOUIS DENISET: Certaines personnes voudraient un organisme qui donnerait des règlements, mais que les stations publiques ne devraient pas être sous le contrôle direct ou faire partie du même organisme que Radio-Canada.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous ne voulez pas voir un même bureau de direction qui régisse les postes privés et publics?

M. LOUIS DENISET: J'ai eu beaucoup d'opinions. Il me semble que d'un côté on doit laisser beaucoup de liberté d'action aux postes privés, et peut-être qu'il serait plus juste que les postes privés, que les postes publics fassent partie d'une Crown Corporation qui soit séparée de l'organisme de Radio-Canada, qui aurait seulement qu'à répondre tout comme les autres postes privés ont à répondre.

Me deGRANDPRE: Si tel est le cas, vous n'auriez plus le monopole à direction unique?

M. LOUIS DENISET: Il faudrait enlever ces mots. Je n'ai pas l'autorité pour les enlever. Je n'ai pas rédigé le texte. J'ai songé à cela depuis quelque temps et je me demande si on ne doit pas étudier la question de nouveau et enlever ces mots.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous ne pourriez pas les enlever étant donné que vous n'avez pas l'autorité nécessaire pour les enlever?

M. LOUIS DENISET: Justement.

M. TURCOTTE: A la page 5, vous dites: "Aider financièrement les postes existent actuellement, et n'en laisser aucun fermer ses portes pour raisons financières". Seriez-vous par hasard informé que quelques-uns de ces postes de langue française de l'Ouest soient menacés financièrement, et est-ce pour cela que vous prévoyez ces difficultés et que vous voulez vous mettre en garde?

M. LOUIS DENISET: Pas à l'heure actuelle, mais si la télévision continue à prendre de l'envergure, il semble que certains postes de radio pourront être affectés. Je ne crois pas que ce soit le cas de Saint-Boniface. Pour les autres postes, j'ai entendu parler qu'ils se posaient la question. Sans sentir des difficultés trop fortes ils craignent pour l'avenir.

M. TURCOTTE: Ils craignent parce que la télévision leur enlevant déjà une partie de leur clientèle ça leur enlèverait une partie de leurs revenus?

M. LOUIS DENISET: Oui. D'ailleurs, ils sont aidés actuellement par des programmes qui viennent de Radio-Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Deniset.

M. LOUIS DENISET: I would like, Mr. Chairman, to thank you as I think I am the last speaker to submit a French brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: In this sitting, yes.

MR. LOUIS DENISET: And I would like to be able to express the sincere thanks of all the others as well as myself for your courtesy in listening to these long elaborations in French. Perhaps I may go further and say that this fact rather underlines as an objective lesson the point we would

like to bring out, namely, that a person may speak French anywhere he likes in Canada, and we are happy to live together, and if you will permit me to be perhaps little more poetical may I say that when we sing "O Canada" we would like to sing it in French or in English because the words are full of emotion in both languages.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. May I say that all the French briefs we have had have been quite obviously well worked out and well delivered, and we appreciate your help.

(Page 1234 follows)

INDIVIDUAL BRIEF

APPEARANCES:

Mr. Jack St. John, M.L.A.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we are to have is an individual brief by Mr. Jack St. John, M.L.A., and I understand he is assisted by Mr. Marshall Shapiro who has a supplementary brief to present. Mr. St. John, will you and Mr. Shapiro take your places at the table and we will mark your memorandum, Mr. St. John, as Exhibit No. 53, and do you wish to file also the address which is an appendix to that memorandum?

MR. ST. JOHN: I do, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we can make that Exhibit No. 53 with the appendix, and Mr. Shapiro's memorandum will be Exhibit No. 54.

EXHIBIT NO. 53: Brief and address by Mr. Jack St. John.

EXHIBIT NO. 54: Brief by Mr. Shapiro.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know you have been sitting here for several days waiting to get started, and you know the way we are proceeding, and I leave it to you as to the extent to which you need to read all this and the extent to which you merely wish to outline it.

MR. ST. JOHN: Thank you, sir. First, I do appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your Commission and I want to congratulate you,

gentlemen, for taking this heavy task and the responsibility that goes with it for the future policies of broadcasting in Canada.

I would also like to have a word of praise for the Federal Government for appointing the Commission; I think they are to be commended for this action. Governments have certain arbitrary powers and can change policies from time to time, but seriously, sir, I think any change of policy or contemplated change of policy of this nature, I think it is well and good that they first seek the opinions of citizens across our country.

I would prefer to read the brief, but I have here not the talk I gave in the House, which I believe is Appendix A, but the brief that I have prepared here is somewhat of a condensation of thoughts that came to me after the resolution was introduced into the House. So, with your permission, I would go ahead and read it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MR. ST. JOHN: This brief is being prepared in the hectic final days of a rather trying and contentious session in the Provincial Legislature, so I would ask you to forgive me if it is somewhat longer than it should be; I have just not had the time to be concise, or to present my points in as orderly a fashion as I would have wished.

Just digressing for one moment, Mr. Chairman, I am being very frank and I think you wish to obtain concise information, and I am going to try to be as frank as possible and I assure you that

in being frank I am not aiming at any personalities or, for that matter, at any corporations. These are my opinions gathered from other citizens and I feel they should be placed fairly and squarely before you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We want to hear them.

MR. ST. JOHN: At the outset, however, I should like to point out that on two specific matters which are of special interest to you, there was very little contention in the Legislature. On the subject of broadcasting and its regulation in the public interest the representatives of Manitoba voters showed unusual unanimity: they wanted additional T.V. stations, independently operated, in Greater Winnipeg and other parts of Manitoba; and they wanted regulation of all broadcasting to be a function entirely separate from the actual operation of such services.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want to interrupt you, but for the purpose of clarity, Mr. St. John, you say "additional T.V. stations, independently operated," as being the view of the Legislative Assembly: Do you think that really is borne out by the actual resolution passed in the House?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, I think so. It was brought out in debate.

THE CHAIRMAN: The actual resolution reads, "Therefore be it resolved that this House go on record as favouring competition in the television broadcasting field in the Greater Winnipeg area."

In other words, the notion of an independently operated or private station is not in the resolution itself.

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, not in so many words, I would say, but I tried to put it there in thought and in action. Possibly if I could go on and finish the brief ...

THE CHAIRMAN: I will try not to interrupt.

MR. ST. JOHN: ... we may come to some unanimity.

This unanimity was shown when, on February 21st, 1956, I presented this resolution to the Legislature:

"Whereas -- Manitoba citizens have a wide
"choice of radio stations;

"And whereas -- there has been a demand
"for the establishment of more than one
"local television station;

"And whereas -- due to Manitoba's geographic position, a great number of our
"citizens have but one choice of a
"television station;

"And whereas -- it is desirable that Manitoba citizens have a wider selection of
"television stations;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House
"go on record as favouring competition
"in the television broadcasting field
"in the Greater Winnipeg area;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the

"Federal Government be urged to encourage the establishment of television stations in other parts of the Province of Manitoba."

For the information of the Commissioners, I made a speech in support of the resolution, and I attach a copy of it here as Appendix A. I had hoped that the attached speech would serve almost "as is" for my appearance before you, with a few slight additions in connection with a separate board of regulation. But when the speech was reported in the press, I was besieged with telephone calls and letters and scores of additional supporting arguments were pressed upon me, and it is only right that I should try to give you as many of those expressions of opinion as I can.

When I presented my resolution, which you have just heard, a Liberal colleague, Mr. T. Hillhouse, a lawyer by profession and a Member of the Legislature for St. Andrews, after the sentiments of the House had been expressed in debate, moved the following amendment:

"And BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the Federal Government be urged to set up and establish an independent board of regulation for Canadian broadcasting."

On Thursday, March 6th, on Division, the amendment was passed by a vote of 47 to 5 -- the most lopsided majority experienced in the Legislature in years. A similar overwhelming majority,

46 to 5, passed the main resolution.

The dissenting votes were those of the Socialists and the one Communist member in the Assembly, all of whom, I believe, are dedicated to the principle of State Ownership and operation of everything.

Support was by no means limited to the Legislature. The resolution was presented on a Thursday night, was reported in the papers on Friday; and by the following Tuesday I had received approximately 220 telephone calls from persons interested. Of these persons -- and this is checked as close as we can get, because the first half-day I didn't keep track and then I thought I should after that -- 216 urged me to carry on the fight, that they were all for it; 3 wanted me to modify my views; and the fourth -- a delightful fellow but possibly a bit of a crank, and I enjoyed talking to him -- and he didn't want a television station at all. In fact, he wanted the present one ripped down.

My wife and I have long since lost track of the number of telephone calls and personal contacts all pressing upon me various arguments and reasons why the present set-up needs revision. I attach, for your information, a sampling of letters received. I have been astounded at the unanimity -- I have earnestly sought to find out what logical arguments exist for the present restrictions and the present method of regulation, but aside from a professor, who claimed that the campaign for more

T.V. stations "brought out the worst in people", I have sought in vain for answers to those questions.

While many have told me they appreciate certain C.B.C. programmes, they have been equally insistent that the C.B.C. monopoly be broken, and that a more democratic method of regulation be adopted.

I trust that gives you the background from which I have prepared the following personal observations for your consideration.

The first is that operation and regulation should be separate functions: As a Liberal, I am appalled at the idea of a Crown corporation, which engages to such a large extent in the advertising business, being in a position to regulate, and then to judge, and then to discipline if it so desires, its competitors. I think this situation has been allowed to develop over the years, because of a mistake made initially by the old Aird Royal Commission on Broadcasting. They recommended that all broadcasting be nationalized; and had that taken place, it would not have been so ludicrous to have the operating body make the regulations. But this country believes in freedom, especially in the field of ideas and information, and the broadcasting industry never was completely nationalized. So allowing the regulatory powers to remain in the hands of the operating body is merely a continuation, I feel, of the old error in judgment.

As a Liberal, I think that should be corrected.

I am ashamed, every time I am confronted with the fact that the C.B.C. -- and this phrase has been used many times -- is judge, jury and prosecutor in such an undemoncratic fashion. I know the National Liberal Federation is uncomfortable about this situation -- they have said so, on more than one occasion.

I am quite sure that though the radio and television contraversy is a complex one, this is one phase which is understood and deplored by the public: they find it offensive, unfair, undemoncratic and difficult to swallow.

Countless Liberals have felt that this has been a thorn in our sides for years. No one has yet given an adequate reason why it shpuld not be corrected forthwith, if retained, I feel it cannot help but lead to the suspicion that the Corporation is a useful political instrument, and is being allowed to retain these powers in order to enable it to control the expression of political views.

I am sure that you must understand that it is somewhat embarrassing to me, as a member of the Liberal Party, to suggest that the Party I support is interested in the Corporation as a political weapon. This is an embarrassment for which I hope you will provide relief, by recommending in the strongest terms that regulation and operation be separate functions in the field of mass communication, just as it is in railroading, transport, and some other fields. I have yet heard no valid reason to the

contrary.

Reasons abound for making the change. A separate board of regulation could be expected to encourage everyone with talent, skill and experience to contribute. Not being charged with the operation of a sort of hybrid Corporation, which is half an advertising vehicle and half a public service vehicle, it would be disinterested in judgment and better able to regulate against the abuses we fear and in favour of the progress we all desire for the broadcasting industry.

Then, there is an unhealthy atmosphere of fear: Because I have been outspoken in my views about broadcasting, all sorts of complaints about the present situation have reached me.

On several occasions I have said, "That sounds bad: why don't you tell the Royal Commission about it?" The answer has usually been, "Do you think I'm crazy? The C.B.C. could crucify me." When it was announced in the press that you gentlemen, in your wisdom, had agreed to hear such complaints in secret, I approached some of those persons again, with the suggestion that they place their complaints before you secretly.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the phrase was "in private", not "in secret".

MR. ST. JOHN: I beg your pardon, sir. The answer was, "How long do you think it would stay a secret? The C.B.C. would find out about it, secret or no secret, and then I'd really be in

the soup."

I believe I can make clear to you, however, the nature of the complaints in such a way that you can see how realistic they are.

One of the first men to congratulate me, and then pour some of his own woes into my ear, was a newspaperman. When I suggested that he make representations to you, he pointed out that nowadays a journalist who doesn't get invited to appear on C.B.C. T.V. panels soon becomes a back number. He went on to say that in his opinion, some of the newspapermen in Ottawa made more money out of T.V. than they received in pay from their publishers. "No wonder", he said, "that they moderate their views about Government departments and Crown companies. If they get too critical, they don't get back on T.V."

He told me also that in his opinion, the C.B.C., because it holds a monopoly on T.V. in the major centres of population, and a monopoly of radio networks, is in a position to influence magazine writers and editors, so that they are less inclined to be critical of Government agencies or the C.B.C. itself.

He said that I could search the records until I went blind, but I would not find any expose of Government foolhardiness in C.B.C. news; whereas newspapers, over the past few years, have made several such exposes.

He went so far as to say that because the C.B.C. can make or break the reputation of

professional men, by playing them up on the one hand or by ignoring them on the other, their political power was becoming enormous. "After all", he said, "these are the new forms of publishing -- and they're tied up tight by a Crown corporation, which, in practice, must please the Cabinet. And a working newspaperman who talks back to them in print is playing with dynamite -- unless his writings are syndicated in major centres of population. They can make him a minor leaguer. He cannot answer back in kind."

I blush to confess that I found this same feeling amongst some politicians. I was told by more than one politician wise in the ways of getting elected that I had made a big mistake in tackling this issue. "They will turn their commentators loose on you", I was told, "and as far as you are concerned, you will never get a break on T.V. in Winnipeg. They'll either attack you or ignore you."

Within a few days after that statement was made to me, one of the C.B.C.'s frequent contributors proclaimed that those who were fighting for more T.V. outlets in Winnipeg were "bringing out the worst in people".

Shortly thereafter, I held a meeting in Winnipeg with local members of the Federal House, home for Easter recess. It was a rather unusual meeting to discuss Manitoba's interests in a natural gas pipeline, and the meeting received considerable attention from the papers, British United Press and Canadian Press wire line services. In spite

of the fact that I took pains to see that a news release went to C.B.W.T., I watched in vain for the slightest whisper about this matter which was front page news to the local papers, and was carried by independent radio stations and newspapers in several major cities in Canada.

Gentlemen, it seems to me that the people of Canada would be up in arms if they realized to what degree our freedom to hear and read the news, whether it be critical of or favourable to the Government of the day, has been taken away. I think they would be terribly disturbed about the atmosphere of fear that exists. We deplore the Russian practice of Government publications. I feel we are justified in fighting against a similar set-up in Canada.

I urge you to examine this situation minutely. I honestly believe that if you fail to correct it to the best of your ability, history will condemn you for it, as I believe it will condemn the Commissioners who issued the Massey Report. Here again, I might say that I have been told that it would be political suicide for me to attack the Massey Report -- to dare to suggest that those professors -- and I think they were nearly all professors -- could have been so wrong; that a book that bore the Royal Crest and looked so impressive could have been so bad. Well, I have studied this book carefully, and political suicide or not, I think it is a terrible document. The Commissioners on that occasion did not come to grips with the important

question of freedom of publication. I know that you gentlemen will study the Massey Report, with a judicial eye, and I am confident you will see, as I see, that the educators were so preoccupied with certain of the finer things of life that they entirely forgot one of the finest -- our very freedom to know the truth.

How on earth can we expect to hear the truth when the major means of publication are a monopoly of a Government agency?

Gentlemen, a free country is one which should make change possible. If, in a free country, a man gets a new idea, a new political idea, he is free to try to persuade others that his idea is useful and good. He can hire a hall. He can put advertisements in the papers. If he can win enough supporters, who will contribute their small sums to further the cause, he can publish a pamphlet and spread the word in various ways. But under our set-up, he cannot buy time on a radio network or on television -- he cannot appear at all. He must first have permission from an agency of the very Government which he may believe is outdated. Surely we in Canada do not wish to perpetuate a situation of this sort.

Now, I am not a Social Creditor, as you know -- I am a Liberal and proud of it -- but I believe the Social Credit idea deserves to be heard. And I believe it was radio which enabled it to have a hearing. I sometimes think the Govern-

ment of the day was sorry it didn't clamp down on Mr. Aberhart's broadcasts sooner -- they let it go too far to be able to stop it. I suggest that it is not right that any Government agency have any control whatsoever of political broadcasting. If political broadcasting is to be regulated, certainly we should take every step we possibly can to see that it is regulated by some group that cannot be hired or fired by the Government of the day. I think they must be in a position almost as unassailable politically as the Auditor General. I have been doing a good deal of watching and listening over the past year or year and a half. I have heard some of the women commentators on the C.B.C. in the afternoons, on the radio here and down East, and it seemed to me that they were devoting a great deal of their time and energy to praising the operations of certain Government departments. As a Liberal, the praise pleased me; but as a liberal, the whole business frightened me. I could not help but wonder if there were not some pretty capable women commentators in the country who would roast certain Government departments if they had the chance, or if they dared.

Then, unfair advertising practices: I have been told again and again -- and I am not hiding behind this "I-have-been-told" phrase -- I agree with the points I have condensed here that the very fact that advertising is heard on the Government agency's T.V. station makes it appear that the product is approved of or sanctioned by or

endorsed by the Crown corporation. I had not heard of that; but when it came to my mind, on due consideration, I see the truth of it. I know that during the war, I tuned to the C.B.C. newscasts because I felt I was getting the Government's own view -- and it seemed to me there was more a feeling of authenticity about it.

Now I know that the independent stations get their news from exactly the same sources; but even yet, there is the feeling that the whole weight and authority of the Crown lies back of the news and advertising on C.B.C. But having purchased some of the products advertised so enthusiastically by the C.B.C., I now have doubts.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder, if C.B.C. is so unpopular, this would not be a very bad market for the advertising?

MR. ST. JOHN: Possibly. This was indicated to me by at least three citizens, so I thought I had better put it in.

THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me you are stretching that pretty far.

MR. ST. JOHN: At any rate, I think it a bad thing that a Crown corporation should appear to endorse the products of certain large manufacturers when our local firms do not have at their disposal facilities to answer back or offer better products or services.

Now I come to the question of more television stations for Winnipeg and Manitoba: I note

that my comments have already gone past the number of pages to which I had hoped to confine them, and I have not begun to cover all the ground. Therefore I will get to one of the main points: Additional competitive outlets for Winnipeg.

At present, we get C.B.W.T. or nothing. We are perhaps the only major centre in Canada in that position. For that reason, complaints have been bitter and explosive and may not have shown due regard for the job the boys and girls at C.B.W.T. have been trying to do. I know many of them, and I think they are very fine people, but we cannot believe they are any more than human, and we do not think that they are capable of handling single-handed the job that needs doing in a growing city like Winnipeg.

We want more stations. We have Winnipeg citizens who have declared themselves able to operate stations, so we can afford more T.V. stations here without costing the Government a cent: on the contrary, they would contribute money in taxes to us and to the Government for the privilege of operating. It is therefore a rather frustrating thing to be denied this freedom of choice by Government decree, for what seems to me to be the flimsiest of reasons.

Gentlemen, there are many things about this present broadcasting set-up which are disturbing to me and to countless friends of mine who class themselves as liberals. But I have already taken up a great deal of your valuable time. Therefore I shall satisfy myself by merely repeating

three requests.

Firstly, that you either recommend a listing of the restrictions on competitive T.V. in Winnipeg at once, or give us much better reasons than we have heard so far for limiting us to a single picture.

Secondly, I respectfully suggest that you recommend to the Government that a separate board of regulation be set up, at the earliest possible moment.

Thirdly, that you come to grips with the fundamental problem of freedom of the press -- whether it be publication by print, or on radio, or over television.

I have one additional comment, because about three or four years ago I read in the papers a report of the appearance of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association before a Parliamentary Inquiry Committee on Broadcasting. It was the good sense that seemed to me to pervade that submission by the weekly editors that really first started me studying the situation. I wish I had a copy here; I meant to try to get it. If I had it I would have added it as Appendix C to this brief. As I recall it, it dealt more forcefully than I could hope to do with the dangers involved when a Government agency enters the entertainment and publishing field.

MR. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I have a copy of this pamphlet, I do not know if it is necessary for me to file it, I believe that you people will no doubt have a copy of it but it is called "Government and Mass Communication - let's take a second look", if you wish to have it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it might be convenient if we file that as Exhibit 55.

EXHIBIT No. 55: Pamphlet entitled "Mass Communication - let's take a second look".

MR. ST. JOHN: I have underlined three or four paragraphs which seem to me to be quite pertinent.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was a submission to the Special Committee of the House of Commons on Broadcasting by the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association in February 1953?

MR. ST. JOHN: That is correct, sir. There is just one more thing, this is a quotation in a letter that I received the other day, I think this might give you some idea of the individual person's thinking. There is a paragraph here noted as criticism of CBC for restraint imposed on building private television stations and it was aired at a meeting of the Canadian Labour Congress at Toronto by a delegate from Winnipeg and he described the CBC monopoly of television in largest centres of population as stupid. He said that the people want freedom to look at what they want instead of pouring millions of dollars into a so-called cultural organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you draw from that? It is just merely quoting something you approve of or

is there any recommendation that flows from it other than the obvious one that you would like more stations?

MR. ST. JOHN: I put this in the record, Mr. Chairman, because I want to try to get before you as many expressions of opinion from private individuals as I possibly can.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we want those, we want all the help we can get. Mr. Coyne, are you going to ask questions on this, or Mr. deGrandpre?

MR. COYNE: I am, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are through with your presentation, Mr. St. John?

MR. ST. JOHN: Yes, I am, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COYNE: Turning for a moment to page 2 of your brief where you recite the resolution of the Manitoba Legislature, you say;

"Therefore be it resolved that this House go on record as favouring competition in the television broadcasting field in the Greater Winnipeg area."

I think you said in reply to a question from the Chairman that you felt what the House had in mind was a privately operated station in competition with the CBC?

MR. ST. JOHN: Yes, sir.

MR. COYNE: Do you contemplate that the CBC station would actively compete with the independent station?

MR. ST. JOHN: Yes.

MR. COYNE: What I mean is this, you know in the radio field for many years it has been the policy of the CBC very largely not to compete in the local

advertising field with the privately-owned stations, in any community, they have left that business field to the private stations, whereas in TV at the moment the CBC stations do solicit local advertisements, do you contemplate in the event of a second station that the CBC would continue to solicit local advertising for TV in competition with the private station?

MR. ST. JOHN: Yes, I do. I was not aware that the Government-owned station here did not compete and go out and try to get advertising on its programmes; I think they should and a second or a third or the whole four channels to be used up, I think CBC should continue to operate and go out and do a job.

MR. COYNE: And compete?

MR. ST. JOHN: And compete.

MR. COYNE: Within its policies for any commercial revenue that is available from the local advertising market?

MR. ST. JOHN: Absolutely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, would you extend that to the suggestion that they ought to go and compete in the radio market today which they are not doing in the local advertising field?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, I do not, as I said, I was not aware that they were not, I have heard advertising on CBW, the CBCradio station.

MR. COYNE: I think that is network advertising, Mr. St. John.

MR. ST. JOHN: That is network advertising?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, this is a policy that we are told that the CBC in order to leave commercial

revenues in the local field, to the privately-owned radio stations, that they do not compete for that local advertising. Now, I wonder how far you go in this idea, do you think it would be a good idea for them to start competing?

MR. ST. JOHN: I do, sir, I think they are in the radio and television business, and they should operate under the same principles as a private station and go ahead and get some business.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you also agree that the private stations should operate under the same principles as the public?

MR. ST. JOHN: I would say yes, both regulated under a separate board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, leaving aside how the regulation is done, you do then admit the principle of State regulation of the private radio and television stations?

MR. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that some measure of control is necessary.

MR. COYNE: Mr. St. John, then going on to the next paragraph of the resolution, you say:

"And be it further resolved that the Federal Government be urged to encourage the establishment of television stations in other parts of the Province of Manitoba."

And now, I wonder if you could indicate to us what the Legislature had in mind when they said that the Federal Government be urged to encourage, are you

thinking in terms of the opening of CBC stations or the provision of finances in some way or another to assist the local interest to found these stations or is it merely a matter of help in these areas to anybody who might wish to found a television station?

MR. ST. JOHN: I think the television picture does provide lots of terrific impact on the home, I think everything should be done to try and make television available to the greatest number of our citizens. Manitoba, as you are aware, has a concentration of population in this area, you go up through the lakes and it is rather sparsely populated, I think by encouragement there, that was meant that maybe some, perhaps in proportion of their capital investment or some plan in an area that normally could not support a television station on its own merits.

MR. COYNE: I think everyone would probably agree that it is a very laudible aim.

MR. ST. JOHN: Excuse me just a moment, I think when I put this into the resolution, I did have this in mind which was mentioned here the other day, that when - with the coming in of live broadcast microwave through the Trans-Canada Television Service that some relay station, if it is possible - now, I am not familiar at all with the technical difficulties, but it would appear to me that there would be some areas that could be covered not all day and evening but, say, for two or three hours in the evening or at a suitable time through either Micro-wave or relay station.

MR. COYNE: What you have in mind, to be specific, is that the Government or CBC should with public funds extend the facilities of television to these areas which would not be able to commercially support their own?

MR. ST. JOHN: Yes, I do not like subsidies but if there is no other way of getting it to them ---

MR. COYNE: You are in favour of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your suggestion of accelerated depreciation is not very practical, is it, because accelerated or any other kind of depreciation is only useful if you have some profits.

MR. ST. JOHN: Yes, maybe that is the wrong word, but some method of making it easier on the operator whether it is the CBC or a private person

THE CHAIRMAN: But I think it really does go, as Mr. Coyne suggests, to the expenditure of public monies to extend the television system into areas that are not now served and which may not, or probably will not be able to support a private station on ordinary commercial revenue?

MR. ST. JOHN: I'm afraid it boils down to that point but there is one thing, by having more television stations in a densely populated area such as Greater Winnipeg, first firms have to buy a show or buy the advertising and have it made up and it costs them money, the advertising of a local manufacturer here, something that the people of Manitoba want is no use some other place, it would have a bearing on the cost of the advertising programme that was put on in

the small station and the advertiser would be encouraged to use over and over again in different parts of the Province the same show, the same picture.

MR. COYNE: Mr. St. John, I assume since we are talking of situations where commercial interests would not be prepared to found stations and, therefore, where the CBC would have to build whatever facilities were thought necessary that in those areas there could only be one television station?

MR. ST. JOHN: I think for practical purposes, yes.

MR. COYNE: In the other parts of your brief which we will turn to for a moment, you have been very critical of the effects of monopoly, do you think it is fair to impose these effects say on the people of Dauphin and vicinity, say, which no doubt you will agree would result from the extension of CBC facilities into that area?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, the individual citizen is a pretty smart man and there is quite a number of stations again operating in this area and news goes out and it is in the newspapers and just the one station giving something to him, he does get a little fed up with it, but I recognize your point.

MR. COYNE: Is not one of the difficulties in television that you do not have all sorts of stations pouring news out to you, the limited range is such that, for instance, in Dauphin it is unlikely they will ever received more than one television picture?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, I do not like to mention

specific places, of course, Dauphin does get a limited picture from Brandon but just at times, because the reception is not very good. Dauphin is on the outside fringe but there is that problem that will have to be faced where in the most extreme cases, only one station can be built.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the dilemma is that you admit the extension of television is desirable and it is a practical matter, it is probably going to have to be done in the more outside area by the CBC but, on the other hand, you say this is a very bad thing because of the monopolistic character of the CBC. Is it better to get TV notwithstanding its disabilities or not get the TV at all and be saved from the evils of monopoly?

MR. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I believe in helping people or areas that are not in a position to help themselves, the area of Greater Winnipeg is in a position to help itself, some of the remote areas ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Leave Winnipeg out of it, I am directing this to the outlying places, you do not help them to get something that you think is dangerous.

MR. ST. JOHN: I would say it is more practical for the CBC to go to the outlying areas than it is in selecting the juicy corners of the Province.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the question.

MR. ST. JOHN: Would you repeat your question?

THE CHAIRMAN: My question is, you say on the one hand as a practical matter the outside services can only be provided by the CBC; on the other hand you say that the CBC monopoly is a bad thing, bad for citizens,

it distorts the news or words to that effect; now, which do you think is better, to send the services out for the benefits that TV will bring or to say they had better not be exposed to this evil, now, which do you want?

MR. ST. JOHN: I would prefer the private operators. I was not aware that I had said that the outside and remote areas of the province would have to be served by the CBC, they would be the only people that could do it. At the moment, the costly operation of TV, I would be inclined to say: "Yes", but in the future I would think that the cost is coming down, just as it has in radio, I would say it is possible that private operators could go in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, as a recommendation, would you suggest we advise the Government in our report that the television system should not be extended to outlying areas until private operators are prepared to go in?

MR. ST. JOHN: No, I do not think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not trying to put you on the spot, I am merely trying to get it clear.

MR. ST. JOHN: I wish I could be of more help to you in this point because I do think in an important medium such as this that we should try to reach the greatest number of people and I think that those are problems which will come just as rural electrification came, gradually, telephone services and other services. I would not imagine anyone would be in the firm position to make a firm recommendation of

servicing small areas unless there was some much more economical way of doing it which I think there will be in the future.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no use saying nobody is in a position to make recommendations, we have to make recommendations on this thing and we are looking for all the help we can get. What I am concerned about is that we would get these inconsistent arguments in a single brief.

MR. ST. JOHN: I am still not quite clear where the argument is inconsistent.

THE CHAIRMAN: On the one hand, you say the CBC will never bring TV to the outlying areas and you say, the resolution says it should be encouraged, therefore, your own legislature was in favour of bringing television to the outlying areas.

MR. ST. JOHN: The Federal Government to give some encouragement to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is a polite way of saying "pay some money", is it not?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, it could be in their wisdom.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, there is one horn of the dilemma, the other horn is that you say in the rest of your brief that monopoly by the CBC is a very bad thing, now, which is it?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, that is a bad thing. There is only - if there is only room for one station in an area, all right, let us consider that as a monopoly, but if there is room for a lot of stations ---

THE CHAIRMAN: You are getting back to Winnipeg, I am asking you about outlying places where, for all practical purposes, we all have to admit there will never be one for a long while.

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, I cannot give you the answer to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was just trying to get it clear.

MR. COYNE: Mr. St. John, turning to the next section of your brief in which you speak of your suggestion that operation and regulation should be separate functions, you say:

"As a Liberal, I am appalled at the idea of a Crown Corporation, which engages to such a large extent in the advertising business, being in a position to regulate and then to judge, and then to discipline if it so desires, its competitors".

I wonder if you would outline for us in any way in which the CBC and the private stations are competitors?

MR. ST. JOHN: The radio you are referring to, of course, they are competing.

MR. COYNE: Well, let us just get that clear, they are not competitors in television, you admit that at the moment?

MR. ST. JOHN: Definitely they are not competitors in television, just to a point of advertising I would say that TV has a very small competitive position

not enough, not nearly enough, due to the fact that they do carry advertising and so do the radios, if there was not a TV, of course, those doing this would probably spend more money on radio advertising.

MR. COYNE: Do you think it would be desirable if the advertising revenue now going to the TV station was transferred over to the radio stations?

MR. ST. JOHN: I would think not from a business standpoint of view, I think the television is a lot better advertising medium but in the radio field there are four stations and one public station in Winnipeg and I feel that they do compete with one another, particularly the private stations, and I feel that the public station does compete for listening audiences. I think it is good for all of them.

MR. COYNE: You said a moment ago that you were not aware that the local CBC radio station did not solicit local advertising?

MR. ST. JOHN: I was not aware of that.

MR. COYNE: But if it is a fact, it has been so represented to us as a policy of the CBC and it seems to be correct ---

MR. ST. JOHN: How do they get their advertising on, do the people just come to them?

MR. COYNE: No, the advertising is limited to those which are carried on a national network and is what is called National Advertising, they do not compete for commercial sponsorship of non-network programmes or spot announcements, but assuming that is so, you would agree, would you not, that the CBC radio station is not

in direct business competition with the private stations?

MR. ST. JOHN: I would not be prepared to admit that, Mr. Coyne.

MR. COYNE: Well, would you explain then, if you can, how the competition in fact exists?

MR. ST. JOHN: The greater the circulation the more valuable advertising space is. Take CBW, there is quite a few people listen to it and when they are listening to it, they are not listening to others.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if they do not compete for the advertising revenue, it does not matter which it is.

MR. ST. JOHN: You were talking about revenue, this was station competition, my point is they did compete for a listening audience.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but to compete for the listening audience - so do the movies compete for the entertainment audience and you use the word pretty loosely but as far as the sale of any commodity is concerned that goes into their balance sheet, where does the competition lie?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, I could not say in dollars and cents business except the National network system.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no competition there.

MR. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, there is a healthy competition with the five stations whether it is in dollars or cents or for the listening public, they have to put on a better show to get a listening

public and drawing lines, what I think is the competition aspect and that is what I would like to get in television.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not your point here, you were talking about regulating and then simply disciplining if need be, its competitors, now, if you are only talking about the loose kind of competition which you can extend far beyond this to other media of entertainment and information that is one thing, we are seeking to find out where in this oft repeated talk about regulating and judging and then disciplining this competition, we are trying to find out what the real validity in that is, and I am having the greatest difficulty in having anyone point out to me where there is any real business competition in this field. I do not say there is not, but nobody seems to be able to tell me where it is.

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, I do not listen to the radio stations enough to say that some of the programmes that are carried on the National network - some of the advertising carried on the National network by CBW, for CBW, might go over to a private station, but they do prefer the National network system first so I think in that there would be an element of competition.

MR. COYNE: That is between the network and the local broadcast carried by the private stations?

MR. ST. JOHN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: And you think there should be no competition of fields, that the CBC should compete with the private stations in local advertising and local private stations should be able to compete with

CBC for national advertising, a free-for-all?

MR. ST. JOHN: Yes, I see no reason why they should not.

MR. COYNE: You say a little further on:

"I am ashamed every time I am confronted with the fact that the CBC is judge, jury and prosecutor in such an undemocratic fashion."

I wonder if you could give us some specific examples of circumstances in which the CBC is judge, jury and prosecutor in such an undemocratic fashion?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, being an operating body and setting up regulations that govern all broadcasting that all other stations must adhere to as well as themselves, I think, it is to me, rather a - it just is not right.

MR. COYNE: Are you suggesting that the primary function of the CBC is that of an operating body?

MR. ST. JOHN: I am not prepared to answer that, I think the prime, first principle is National programming on the National network system.

MR. COYNE: But surely this is fundamental to this charge that they are judge, jury and prosecutor. I will tell you the point I was leading to was this, that if you read the Canadian Broadcasting Act and it appears to contemplate that the CBC shall operate a National broadcasting system and for that purpose it will operate broadcasting stations, but will also guarantee the operations of a private station in a single national broadcasting system. Now, if that is a primary function of

the CBC, surely it is not judging between two elements but simply administering a single element, namely, the National Broadcasting system that it has been set up to operate.

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, they do have a pretty strong control over the private stations. I have here a regulationn ---

THE CHAIRMAN: They have the same kind of control, Mr. St. John, that a merchandizing company exercises over its independently owned sales outlet, their job is to distribute a national programme in exactly the same way as a private company selling goods to distribute goods. You would never suggest for a moment that the Imperial Oil Company could not have some power of regulation over the privately-owned stations, distributing their own goods?

MR. ST. JOHN: If they own the station, they should have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh no, if they make an arrangement with an independent man to operate it they have, and he knows and goes in of his own free will.

MR. ST. JOHN: I think he should be able to operate in as free a manner as he wants, he could sell his gasoline at ten cents a gallon if he wants.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am talking about the standpoint of cleanliness, for instance?

MR. ST. JOHN: It is to the advantage of all, of course, that he operates in a good, businesslike manner. Part of the regulations for sound broadcasting here are carried out by the CBC, these are regulations that they

must carry out to control the character of language on all programmes broadcast by the Corporation, all private stations and to govern the amount of time which may be devoted to political broadcasts by private stations, to assign such time on an equitable basis for rival candidates; the private stations shall furnish to the corporation such information as to their programme as the corporation feel necessary for the proper administration. I think these things go quite a long way, I think those things should be handled and carried out, if all these regulations are necessary, by a board who is not in the operation of radio or television.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On the other hand, it has been pointed out to us that under the terms of the Act it says that there shall be a national broadcasting system and powers to maintain that system have been given to the Canadian Broadcasting System or the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; in their wisdom they have decided that it will be a co-operative job between themselves and private stations. Now, if they are going to carry out the functions to have a national network it seems to me or it has been pointed out to us, at least, that they must have some control over these private stations who are part of the system.

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, I think the principle of a national network system is excellent and I cannot see why it still could not be carried out or regulated by an independent board, if the CBC loses one station, or does not want one station, it can negotiate with another and away they go.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The claim has been made to us while we have been sitting ~~that~~ the C.B.C. have been given the responsibility of carrying out a national network and to do so, since they have the responsibility, they must have the authority: What would you say to that?

MR. ST. JOHN: Couldn't they be given the authority, in the stations that composed the national chain, of an independent Board?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You feel it could be done through an independent board?

MR. ST. JOHN: I really do.

MR. COYNE: First of all, with regard to those regulatory powers which you read out of the Act, do you feel that those powers should be eliminated or merely transferred, the jurisdiction over the powers should be transferred to an independent board?

MR. ST. JOHN: Some of these regulations I don't disagree with. I think probably when I stated earlier that some measure of control was necessary, in actual practice I think if they were given to the independent board, and as time went on, modified or changed around or something -- whatever the board saw fit -- it would actually place the C.B.C. in a much stronger position, and leave a better taste in people's mouths.

MR. COYNE: What do you in practice envisage from this independent regulatory board? What effect is it going to have?

MR. ST. JOHN: First, I can't see that it would weaken the national network or the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Rather to the contrary, I think it would strengthen -- certainly strengthen the public relations of the C.B.C.

MR. COYNE: Well, at one place a little further on you say that this board would be disinterested in judgment, which seems to imply that in your view the C.B.C. is interested in judgment. I wonder if you could indicate to us, if you have thought about it, what interest other than the public interest the C.B.C. has in any of these matters? My difficulty is this, that the C.B.C. is not in business to make a profit; it has been set up by the Parliament of Canada to operate broadcasting in the public interest, and that would appear to be the sole standard of interest which they have. How would the independent regulatory board, which I would judge would also consider matters in the public interest, differ in its judgments or decisions, if you like, in any way from the C.B.C.?

MR. ST. JOHN: I don't think they would maybe differ in most of the cases, but the feeling that "here is an operator and he also controls me" is not a good one. The feeling would be entirely different if there was an independent board, and in their operations they may operate exactly the same as the Board of Governors of the C.B.C. today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wouldn't you just transfer the irritation to the new board? What is

the difference?

MR. ST. JOHN: No, sir. The irritation, the blame, the criticism that the C.B.C. receives possibly today on some of these things is not their fault. It is handed down to them, the policy, by an Act of Parliament. How many people really realize that? The man in the street? It is C.B.C.; they are the ones who are criticized.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it will be the independent television authority, or whatever it is called, that will be then.

MR. ST. JOHN: Great; let him be. The Board of Transport Commissioners, I suppose you have heard that many times; the privately-owned railway and the publicly-owned system, they decide a lot of questions. It is not the Board of Governors of the Canadian National Railway who pass judgment on the operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

THE CHAIRMAN: They are the ones that pass judgment on the operation of the Canadian National Railway.

MR. ST. JOHN: The Board of Transport Commissioners.

THE CHAIRMAN: No; the Board of Directors of the C.N.R. pass judgment on the operations of the Canadian National Railway.

MR. ST. JOHN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And this is the operation of the Canadian Broadcasting System.

MR. ST. JOHN: Subject to certain

regulations which have to be passed by Board of Transport Commissioners -- increase in freight rates and things like that.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Let us get back to the first point. The C.B.C. have been clothed with the authority to run a national broadcasting system which will disseminate their programmes or disseminate whatever is necessary in the way of information, education, news, etcetera, throughout the whole country. If there is a separate regulatory board and that body made regulations which did not permit of this national coverage, where do we go? In other words, it has been pointed out to us that as long as the responsibility is placed in the hands of the C.B.C. they must have the authority which would give them the right to establish this national system. In other words, they seem to think that you cannot divorce responsibility from authority.

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, the C.B.C. operate under an Act of Parliament, and I am certain that if an independent board were set up it would operate under an act of Parliament, and one of the terms of the Act would be that a national system must be maintained, and a national programming service; I don't know if that is in the Act or not. I would imagine that the independent board must operate to that end, or regulate to that end.

MR. COYNE: Really, are you not saying, in effect, that you feel that the present Canadian

Broadcasting Corporation and its Board of Directors in some way or other consults some other interest than the public interest in reaching their decisions, whereas the independent regulatory board, for some reason or other, would not?

MR. ST. JOHN: They would be just what the name implies -- independent and unbiased in their decisions. I would like to believe it was not true, but it is only human nature that you are in business ---

THE CHAIRMAN: But they are not in business.

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, just a minute.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Not to make a profit, anyway.

MR. COYNE: Not a business anybody else would like to be in.

MR. ST. JOHN: However, they are in operation and they are in the publishing field and they have control of the issuing -- let me correct that. They have to be consulted before a new license is granted. Their recommendation is asked for and, as I understand it, the Transport Board when they receive the application from John Jones they cannot pass on that application; they cannot make a decision until it has been referred to the C.B.C. Board of Governors for a recommendation, and then the recommendation goes back to the Transport Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Department of Transport.

MR. ST. JOHN: Yes, the Department of Transport, I beg your pardon. Their recommendation, as far as I know, has always been accepted in about 175 cases, but one single case the decision was reversed -- again, a place by the name of St. John.

MR. COYNE: Would you envisage that the independent regulatory board would not consult with or hear the C.B.C. on one of these applications?

MR. ST. JOHN: I think the board would be remiss in its duty if it did not hear the pros and cons of applications from all sides.

MR. COYNE: Supposing a situation of this kind arose where an application came forward for a license before this independent board and they called on the C.B.C. to express its views, and the C.B.C. said, "We must oppose this application because the result of it being granted will be that we will suffer a revenue loss of \$3 million a year in the area the station is proposing to enter, and the result of that will be we will have to withdraw our service from outlying areas. Therefore, in the public interest, we think this application should be turned down." Now, wouldn't the independent regulatory board have, in the public interest, to take into account that effect if they established that it was correct?

MR. ST. JOHN: If they established that it was correct, and if the C.B.C. is in business, if they are going to lose \$3 million ---

MR. COYNE: No, the C.B.C. are not going to lose anything, but the Canadians who are in these

outlying areas are going to lose service.

MR. ST. JOHN: Those factors would have to be taken into consideration and proved -- substantiated.

MR. COYNE: But they would have to be taken into consideration by the independent board in exactly the same way as they are now taken into consideration by the C.B.C.?

MR. ST. JOHN: I am not sure how they are taken into consideration just now; I am not prepared to answer that. But if the area in question where the application was concerned, revenue loss to the C.B.C. or not, if the area was large enough and in the opinion of the independent board -- let us call them experts, good common sense people -- and there is room for another application, I would say, for heaven's sake grant it and let the C.B.C. stand on its own feet.

MR. COYNE: You would say, in effect, that the independent board should say to itself, "Yes, we will grant your application because you can operate a business successfully here even though the result is that Canadians in many other parts of the country are going to be deprived of a service"; in that hypothetical circumstance posed, do you think that would be a proper exercise of judgment in the public interest?

MR. ST. JOHN: I think it is very hypothetical.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is very practical.

MR. COYNE: Admittedly -- well, I should correct myself: It is very practical according to the representations we hear from the C.B.C.

MR. ST. JOHN: Has there been such a case before?

MR. COYNE: There has been no application for a second television license heard.

MR. ST. JOHN: Has there been such a case with a radio license?

MR. COYNE: I could not tell you whether the particular set of circumstances I was posing ---

THE CHAIRMAN: This thing came up largely in connection with television stations.

MR. ST. JOHN: I appreciate that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave this question of an independent board, on page 5 you say, "I am quite sure that though the radio and television controversy is a complex one, this is one phase which is understood and deplored by the public: they find it offensive, unfair, undemocratic and difficult to swallow." Will you, for my satisfaction, say "deplored by some of the public"? I distrust these absolutes.

MR. ST. JOHN: I will apologize for not putting in the word "some" because it is only some of the public that are aware of the regulations in the Act.

THE CHAIRMAN: Part of our difficulty, and I would like you to understand the difficulty, because I am not just debating words, but the very

next brief we are getting -- and we are glad to have your own individual views -- but the next brief we are getting is from the Manitoba Federation of Labour which represents a group of 60,000 people in Manitoba, and as part of their brief they say, "We see no reason for the appointment of another board", dealing with this very point. So, these things are not just as open-and-shut as you would suggest by a statement such as that. It is this conflict of opinion. It is not as clear-cut -- if it were as clear-cut as what you say it is, there would be no reason for a Royal Commission, but it is not this way. There is great divergence of opinion.

MR. ST. JOHN: Let us put it that it is my opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you are bringing in the public here and I just wondered how valid it was.

MR. ST. JOHN: Those who took the trouble to call me and were interested, I would say that out of -- again, I am not using exact figures -- I would say a good 10% were aware of what I say here is deplored by the public.

MR. COYNE: Just turning to page 6, and I think this is still on the question of the independent board, in the last paragraph you say, "A separate board of regulation could be expected to encourage everyone with talent, skill and experience to contribute." Would you explain to us in what way you feel a separate board of regulation would encourage everyone with talent, skill and experience

to contribute? How are they going to function to have that effect?

MR. ST. JOHN: I think the first thing an independent board would do would be to grant some of these licenses -- additional outlets.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You are talking about television, of course?

MR. ST. JOHN: Yes; it could apply to radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is not really what you are talking about in that sentence. You are talking about a board of regulation encouraging everyone with talent, skill and experience to contribute. That has nothing to do with granting T.V. licenses, has it? We are just anxious to get what you mean by the sentence.

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, they are not in the business and they have -- I think, Mr. Chairman, the point in my thinking there in that paragraph was simply that there would be some stations granted licenses, and inasmuch as there would be more stations there would be more opportunity.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see.

MR. COYNE: Mr. St. John, do I gather from that that you anticipate that this board, unlike the C.B.C. Board at present, will grant licenses? At the present time licenses are granted by the Governor-in-Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Transport. Surely you are not suggesting that this board of regulation is actually going to be the license issuing authority?

MR. ST. JOHN: I would like to see it that way but whether -- that would be -- I think an independent board should have power to license under the Act.

MR. COYNE: Doesn't that really remove from Parliament control over channels including the administration of international agreements in respect of channels? I don't think it has been suggested to us so far.

THE CHAIRMAN: You need not waste time on that, because we cannot make the recommendation. The terms of reference make it explicit that the exclusive use of certain frequencies or channels for broadcasting shall continue to be under the control of the Parliament of Canada.

MR. ST. JOHN: I agree with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would have thought you would, from the rest of your brief, and I was astonished at your statement that you thought this board should do it.

MR. ST. JOHN: I agree the people should do that.

MR. COYNE: Just going on at the top of page 7 you refer to an answer you received to a suggestion that somebody tell the Royal Commission about the complaints, and the answer was, "Do you think I am crazy? The C.B.C. could crucify me." I don't want to ask you in what way you think the C.B.C. could crucify him, but what possible difference do you think an independent board would make

to this situation?

MR. ST. JOHN: I think there would be -- I know there would be the feeling that C.B.C. does not control the operation of ---

THE CHAIRMAN: But the example you give of this timid and unfortunate journalist who is afraid to criticize the C.B.C. because he won't be taken on a C.B.C. T.V. panel; well, the C.B.C. is still going to have these panels with or without an independent regulatory board, so how would the journalist be any more courageous in criticizing the C.B.C. with an independent board there?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, this chap, sir, was one of the very strong ones in his criticism, as you see in my quotation here, and very strong in his support for a drive for more privately-owned television stations. He felt he could go on private stations and criticize all he wanted, but if he did that publicly now, like some of the other chaps who did it, they didn't remain commentators too long.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I am personally, and I think the other Commissioners are, very concerned about this suggestion you made about the atmosphere of fear that pervades this situation, but from our inquiry's point of view it is an almost impossible task to get to the bottom of it if we don't get something we can go on -- not an unidentified pretty loose statement of something that somebody fears may happen. Do you know of any case of a journalist being kept off a C.B.C. panel because he

has previously criticized the C.B.C.?

MR. ST. JOHN: I could say yes, but I would not want you to ask me the name of the party.

THE CHAIRMAN: I won't press you for the name of the party, but if there are cases of it I would like to find them somehow so that we could run them down. I won't press you for names, of course, but I don't believe the profession of journalism in Canada has become so weak that it is not prepared to criticize, and if there have been many criticisms and there have been these results I would like to know what they are, rather than this vague kind of fear, "if I am not careful something may happen to me". So, if you have any such specific cases, give us chapter and verse and we will run it down and see whether or not there is validity in them or not.

MR. COYNE: Mr. St. John, turning to page 8 on the third line, and I just want to insert a phrase that you used there, you are complaining about the C.B.C. and the fact that it has a monopoly of radio networks, and I suppose that is true in this sense: that the only radio networks at the moment are operated by the C.B.C. and the C.B.C. controls the establishment of radio networks. On the other hand, there is nothing to prevent anyone from applying to the C.B.C. for the organization of a network on a casual or other basis through which private stations could simultaneously distribute their products, and when we asked Mr. Dunton the question as to whether anyone had ever applied to

him for the right to operate a private national network he said the answer was "no". Now, the only point of my question is, why do you complain about the C.B.C. having a monopoly of radio networks when no one, apparently, has come forward with any suggestion that they want to operate networks, any practical suggestion based upon the required business organization and financial arrangements?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, the fact that they have not done it would intimate to me that they saw very little likelihood of an application being granted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, really.

MR. COYNE: Surely no one is that timid?

MR. ST. JOHN: When you want to establish a national network it does not mean writing down on a piece of paper and sending in your application; you have to contact stations across the country and show some faith that you are interested in it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The trouble is that the cost of operating a national broadcasting system for 16 million people scattered across 4,000 miles is a very expensive business, and the cost of operating a national network is a thing that can only be accomplished by some expenditure of public monies. Is it not fair to say, probably, that the reason there has not been an application for this is not because if they applied they would be turned down, but because they thought it would not be a profitable venture?

MR. ST. JOHN: Did Mr. Dunton intimate

at all that three or four stations wanted to join together to form a network within a province or a given area?

MR. COYNE: They do it now, in Quebec there is a network called the Trans-Quebec Network which is a commercial network operated by a group of private stations.

MR. ST. JOHN: I did not know that.

THE CHAIRMAN: These loose charges of monopoly of radio network, when you pick up the facts you find it does not hold up, that is why we are having these discussions to bring out these points.

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, it is very interesting, Mr. Chairman, and I never inquired into it to see if anybody had made an application for it, but I assume from your talk with Mr. Dunton, from your knowledge of the subject, that if they do they will be granted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, they could be granted but there would be obligations.

MR. ST. JOHN: The C.B.C. would look with favour upon it no doubt.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 9, Mr. St. John, towards the bottom of the page you are speaking about degree and I gather you regard it as a substantial degree to which our freedom to hear and read the news, whether it be critical of or favourable to the Government of the day, has been taken away. Our freedom to read and hear the news, I wonder if you could expand on that a little?

MR. ST. JOHN: In the regulations and control, that is one of the points I quarrelled with the Massey Commission on, they bring that point out and then shy away from it.

MR. COYNE: But how does the operation of the C.B.C. take away our freedom to read and hear the news, they do not monopolize news?

MR. ST. JOHN: But they have control over its content and character.

MR. COYNE: Oh, I wonder.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not according to the evidence we have had in Winnipeg.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And in Ottawa we asked that question whether or not the news broadcasts were edited by the C.B.C. before being put out by a private station and the answer was "no".

THE CHAIRMAN: That may be a power.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But it is not used apparently.

THE CHAIRMAN: You say "has been taken away"?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, the power I would think is in there and I am glad to hear it has not been used. If has not been used why do they not take that section out?

THE CHAIRMAN: They may think in connection with news it would have to be done in times of national emergency; it may be things that would be obscene or improper or something like that.

MR. COYNE: You are making a positive

statement that the freedom to hear and read the news has been taken away, and I want to know how it has been taken away?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, the freedom has been taken away under that control, it has never been used, but, nevertheless, it is still there, it is not absolute freedom the same as a newspaper publisher has.

THE CHAIRMAN: You go on to say:

"I urge you to examine this situation
"minutely. I honestly believe that if
"you fail to correct it to the best of
"your ability history will condemn you
"for it -- "

I think probably they will condemn us anyway, but what is it you are really after with this news, do you want the C.B.C. to get out of putting out any newscasts?

MR. ST. JOHN: No, I want them to stay in the newscasts if they see fit, but I do not think they should have any control or be able to examine or have to examine the newscasts or the information that goes out over a private station.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Even in time of war or national emergency?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, national emergency is an entirely different picture. In national emergency I could appreciate that.

MR. COYNE: On the following page you say, just at the end of the page:

"How on earth can we expect to hear the
"truth when the major means of publication
"are a monopoly of a Government agency?"

Now, I would like to change that question around
and ask you for the answer you would give, supposing
it read, "How on earth can we expect to hear the truth
when the major means of publication are a monopoly
of a private commercial operation"?

MR. ST. JOHN: The same thing would hold.

MR. COYNE: Well, we have heard reports
concerning a medium-sized city in Eastern Canada where
the one newspaper and the one radio station and the
one television station were owned by the same in-
dividual, and it was suggested to us that this was
an unsatisfactory suggestion. And in the same brief
it was suggested that it was of value that the C.B.C.
should be in a position to exercise control over
private stations. You do not agree with that?

MR. ST. JOHN: I do not agree that the
C.B.C. should be able to exercise control over pri-
vate stations.

MR. COYNE: But you give this independent
regulatory board control over private stations?

MR. ST. JOHN: I think that would be
reasonable.

MR. COYNE: Now, if you object to con-
trol by a Government organ over matters of communi-
cation or information, how can you possibly say
that one Government body should not have it but
another Government board should? Do you think

there is an inconsistency there?

MR. ST. JOHN: Where the power is in the operation field itself I think it is wrong, I think I have made myself clear, I think it is wrong that they should exercise control.

THE CHAIRMAN: But that is not what you say; you say that the major means of publication are the monopoly of a Government agency.

MR. ST. JOHN: The major means of publication is the television, it is a very potent means of communication, in my opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: But in the twenty-five private television stations, they can put out a news coverage if they want to.

MR. ST. JOHN: They can. I am referring to the position here in Winnipeg and not to these other places in Canada.

MR. COYNE: Now, on page 11 again you say:

"I suggest that it is not right that any

"Government agency have any control what-

"soever of political broadcasting."

You referred a moment ago to Section 21 of the Broadcasting Act where the C.B.C. may make regulations to prescribe the portion of time which may be devoted to political broadcasts and to assign such time on an equitable basis to all Parties and rival candidates; do you think that is a bad thing to do or to have in the Broadcasting Act? I am thinking particularly of the matter of assigning such time

on an equitable basis to all Parties and rival candidates; is that something which should be removed?

MR. ST. JOHN: Oh, I think that is a very good regulation.

MR. COYNE: Does that not necessarily involve control by a Government agency over political broadcasting?

MR. ST. JOHN: I can buy time to put on a political speech on a private station in Winnipeg here but I cannot on the C.B.C. station.

MR. COYNE: No, but ---

MR. ST. JOHN: It is a network and I want to go on the network from here to the Coast.

MR. COYNE: And does your political opponent have an opportunity which you do not have?

MR. ST. JOHN: He is in the same position.

MR. COYNE: So there is no inequity as between Parties?

MR. ST. JOHN: That is right, there is no unfair dealing there.

MR. COYNE: Just going to your section on unfair advertising practices, you say that by reason of the fact that the C.B.C. takes advertising it appears that the product advertised is approved of or sanctioned by the Crown company; I would like to ask you this question: You receive programmes from the National Broadcasting Company, say, from Bismark, and if you are in in the afternoon you will hear them advertising the products of Proctor & Gamble, and a little later in the afternoon they

advertise the products of Lever Bros. Now, do you feel when you hear these broadcasts that the National Broadcasting Company is endorsing the products of these companies?

MR. ST. JOHN: This never occurred to me until two chaps were talking to me about it.

MR. COYNE: But you now see something to it?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, I started looking at the machine and I think it should be that when a nationally advertised product comes on it should be distinctly stated that this station, that the time paid for this is by and the responsibility of the statements made are by the company that made them, that is, the advertiser -- Proctor & Gamble, for instance. I do not know, but I think it is a practical solution.

MR. COYNE: That is, you are not suggesting that the mere fact that the network in Canada is called the C.B.C. and the network in the United States is called N.B.C. that you have any different reaction as between the programme from the two networks in this regard?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, one is a private network and the other is a Crown corporation.

MR. COYNE: What difference does that make?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, these persons' views here, two people's views that put this idea into my head, they talk about the Crown corporation, does the Government endorse these products? If

the product is not right can I sue the Government?

THE CHAIRMAN: You should have asked them if the product was not right and it was advertised on the N.B.C. could they sue them, and that would end the discussion.

MR. ST. JOHN: Of course, on that point, any newspapers, as I understand it, if they advertise a product and it is bad, it takes all the hair off your head or something, you can go ahead and sue the newspaper; but I am in doubt about that and I won't take that as a firm local opinion.

MR. COYNE: Just turning to your final section with regard to the additional television stations, towards the bottom of page 13 you say:

"We want more stations. We have Winnipeg
"citizens who have declared themselves
"able to operate stations, so we can afford
"more T.V. stations here without costing
"the Government a cent."

Now, are you really sure about the literal accuracy of that rather sweeping statement, "without costing the Government a cent"?

MR. ST. JOHN: Yes, I am prepared to defend that statement. I think that applications, I understand three have been made and with their own money they will build a station, they will buy programmes, I do not see where the Government, how it could cost the Government any money.

MR. COYNE: This may not be a fair question to you and you can just say you cannot answer

it if you wish: Do you happen to know if any of these applications have included in their plans the carrying of any C.B.C. programmes?

MR. ST. JOHN: I could not say that, I do not know the nature of the applications, I have never seen them.

THE CHAIRMAN: When we had the Private Broadcasting Association in front of us in Ottawa we asked them if they wanted to remain part of the national broadcasting system receiving national television programmes, and they said they did. Now, it is an assumption that you would want similar terms?

MR. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, could I ask this question: If applications went in there to build private television stations specifically stating that they did not desire to use any of the C.B.C. programmes and they desired to pay for everything they got, would that make a difference?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know, we have to go into that, whether it would make a difference or not. I do not know.

MR. COYNE: Could you tell me, in the development of this general public demand for a second station in Winnipeg and a choice of channels, has any consideration really been given in practical terms to the type of programme that you are likely to get on the second channel? I mean, is it just a matter of saying that you would like a second programme which anybody could say -- or have any studies been made as to the type of programming

which would be possible in fact for commercial broadcasting stations to produce?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, that is a very good point and I have here -- there have been talks about the type of programme that C.B.C. has done and I enjoyed the talk that Mr. Findlay gave on the same thing. He recognized that there is no ideal programme, a programme that will suit everybody. I do enjoy, for instance, symphony music and I do not like wrestling. Now, that is neither here nor there, I might not get the music on the other station, I might get a combination of advertising or some junk show, something I do not like at all. However, I have turned to it and I do not like it. Now I have turned back to the C.B.C. and I am quite sure that I will be much more satisfied with C.B.C. shows. I might state that I spent some time in Duluth listening to T.V. and it is chucked full of advertising and I do not like advertising and I did not like the show. When I got back here I was satisfied for a little while with the shows of C.B.C., but it gradually wears off -- you see one good show or three good shows and you see one bad one, and you remember the bad one and you are sore as a boil at the C.B.C. If you had the chance to turn to another channel or two other channels I am sure we would appreciate the programming service of the C.B.C. much more, and I think an awful lot of the criticism would die away.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. St. John, it may be

an expensive venture for somebody to create an alternative T.V. programme in order to create satisfaction with the C.B.C.

MR. ST. JOHN: Does that matter? If someone wants to put his money into a venture and he loses it, so what? He loses his money. I got a little bit excited last fall about a particular show I heard, there was quite a lot of criticism about it; I wrote down East and received a very fine letter from Mr. Jennings, I believe it was; he was very co-operative and he explained and he did say in his letter he was rather surprised at the criticism here because the same show had been on in Vancouver and they had not received nearly as much criticism out there. There are alternative stations there but we just have the one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you ever get mad at something in the newspapers?

MR. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I have been mad at them more times than enough.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you not think that this irritation could be a good thing?

MR. ST. JOHN: Well, one day I like both papers and other days I do not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, this has been most interesting, Mr. St. John. I hope you do not misunderstand the direction of our questions; I should have said this at the beginning, we question to try and bring out the exact meaning and to make sure the full point has been considered. I had

hoped this extra brief that came in could be heard, we could perhaps have a look through it immediately when we come back this afternoon and we will consider it then.

MR. SHAPIRO: I will come back this afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are a little behind our schedule and since it was not filed according to the rules, we took it only on Mr. St. John's suggestion and we will have to ask you to be concise this afternoon, Mr. Shapiro.

MR. SHAPIRO: Very well, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn now until 2.30.

---The Commission adjourned for lunch.

---On resuming at 2.30 P.M.:

INDIVIDUAL BRIEF

APPEARANCES:

Mr. Marshall Frederick Shapiro.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shapiro, we have already marked your brief as Exhibit No. 54, and I find that I did you an unintended injustice in suggesting that you hadn't got it in on time. What I was thinking of was Mr. St. John's request that we hear you now. Will you proceed, please?

MR. SHAPIRO: Yes. Before I start, I have a few corrections to make: On page 3, the first line, it says, "The C.B.C. would act as a competing network within the private network." That should be "with" not "within".

Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the terms of reference set up by the Royal Commission on Broadcasting, I respectfully submit my brief.

It is my opinion that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should be dissolved and all televisions and broadcasting stations should be sold to private parties. This is in the interest of the democratic principle of free and private enterprise.

Not only would the Government be spared from its obligation of its annual grant to this organization, but it would also receive all money from the purchase of these properties and equipment which are now owned by the Canadian Broadcasting

Corporation.

However, if this solution to the problem is not possible, or if the members of the Royal Commission on Broadcasting think it improbable, I have another solution to the problem in hand.

I believe there is a place for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Canada, along with a very few countries, has a very vast northland, in which there are quite a number of inhabitants. These people are in need of steady communication with the rest of the nation. However, no private network would broadcast into this region for fear that it would be a losing proposition. And they are right, for what company would want to sponsor a show into a territory which as far as the sale of their products is concerned, is dead? Here the C.B.C. has its value. By transmitting programmes to these people in the trading posts, in logging camps, trappers, traders, etc., the C.B.C. would be doing a service and would assist in the unification of the Canadian nation.

What I have mentioned is entirely a radio venture and is definitely impractical as far as television broadcasting is concerned. Therefore, I am in full accord with the radio network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and in fact, I am rather happy that we have one. But, television is an entirely different type of enterprise. Its main function is entertainment, with the latest news and timely information second, education third and general information last. In radio, however,

education, information and entertainment are pretty well on even terms, especially so now that television is available to everyone in the province and in the country.

In summation of this part of the brief I would recommend that the television facilities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation be sold outright to private parties, in the interests of our sacred democratic society, and also, to spare the people of Canada from contributing, through grants and taxation, to an organization which has no potential value to the people of the nation and is a symbol of the very society which millions of Canadians would give their lives to combat. I speak of the advanced form of socialism-Communism.

Article (b): From article (a) of this brief, it is evident that what I maintain is that the Canadian Government should realize that we, the Canadian people, are against any socialistic organizations, be they C.B.C., T.C.A. or C.N.R., etc. We, the Canadian people, want a system wherein each one of us, individually, can reach the top of the income ladder and we realize that the only way we can ever reach our goals is through the system of private enterprise, where every man may become a millionaire without depending on the Government for support.

We also know that anything made in a competitive society is a better product than that made in a socialistic society. It is, therefore,

my opinion that the Canadian Government propose to the National Association for Radio and Television Broadcasters that a network of private subscribing stations be set up and that this network would produce a good portion of its own shows. This would be a permanent network. Also, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should continue its transmission of television broadcasts and shows for a set period of time, not to exceed three years. After this three-year period is up the C.B.C. property should be sold as outlined in (a). The reasons for this proposal are obvious:

(i) The C.B.C. would act as a competing network with the private network and in this way the Canadian people would benefit by getting better television productions.

(ii) Before the three-year period would be up, the Government in all likelihood would receive applications from other interested parties wishing to construct similar networks, thereby insuring the Canadian people of a perpetual competition between networks similar to the Columbia Broadcasting System and the National Broadcasting Company in the United States. Competition is healthy!

(iii) By the sale of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's television facilities the Canadian Government would receive money which could be put to better

use. The country needs more and better schools, roads, parks, etc. While old-age pensioners starve, the Government is spending the hard-earned money on something the majority of the people are adverse to. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, along with some other impositions, is commonly considered to be one of the prices of being a citizen of Canada.

(iv) With the establishment of more stations and the private network, more Canadians would be employed and, therefore, the unemployment problem would be substantially reduced. In order to get stations running, the buildings must be constructed; therefore carpenters, bricklayers, etc. who are in the building field, would be working. Once the station is in operation, there will be a need for janitors, technicians, cameramen, stenographers, reporters and countless other professions. The television stations would add to the Canadian scene and nothing but good could come from the establishment of private stations and networks.

(v) Most important is the freedom which will come with the establishment of private television. The people will be able to view whatever they like. Communications in the hands of the Government is

dangerous and public ownership is anti-democratic.

I find it necessary to bypass article (c) of the terms of reference, as my proposal does not allow for the upkeep of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. However, I do suggest that all forthcoming grants be divided by one-half and that the C.B.C. discontinue its practice of 40/60% financing of television productions. That is, paying 40% of the cost of production. I would, instead, recommend either a 10/90% share or an 85/15% split. I do definitely oppose the 40/60% split. I feel that the C.B.C. is not justified in spending the taxpayers' money when private organizations could, and would, use their own funds for the production of their shows. I know the American networks do not split to such an extent and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has no justification for doing so either.

As for culture, the pro-C.B.C. factions argue that private television would forsake the cultural programmes, such as symphonies, ballets, plays, etc. I challenge them to look at American television and tell me that there is no culture. One of the greatest symphonies in the world is the NBC symphony orchestra. This symphony is operated by the National Broadcasting Company, a private organization, which presents the orchestra on its radio and television shows quite frequently. Private enterprise knows that they must cater to the majority of the people and, although the C.B.C. may choose to

ignore it, the people are cultured and want good cultural shows. The C.B.C. underestimates its viewers with shows like the Denny Vaughn, Billy O'Connor, Holiday Ranch and the like. When they do put on culture, they present an opera, the Marriage of Figaro, which was a truly mediocre production.

In introducing opera on television a more suitable show would have been any one of a number of fine operas, Aida, Carmen, Madame Butterfly, La Boheme, Lucia de Lammermoor, Manon Lescaut, Pagliacci, to mention just a few. For the most part C.B.C. shows are vulgar and in bad taste. A C.B.C. Vancouver production used a very crude dialogue in a production having to do with women's clothes and the illustrations were quite vulgar. An Easter show entitled "The Hill" made a mockery of the Bible by attempting to modernize the story of the Crucifixion. "The Hill" would have been laughed at by the producers of the American shows and would, definitely, never have been shown.

Article (d): As I have previously outlined, I am in accordance with the radio network of the C.B.C., although I do feel that it need not be carried on on such a wide scale. It is only in the northland that the C.B.C. might be necessary and as far as the southern portion of Canada is concerned, private radio gives it more than adequate coverage.

Article (d): As outlined before, I recommend the end of the 40/60% split in production

costs on television shows. This would decrease the size of the annual grant of the Government to C.B.C. As for the management of the funds, I feel that this job belongs in the hands of those who actually know what is happening, and I therefore recommend that the handling of the C.B.C. be put into the hands of the C.B.C. Finance Director, or whatever his proper title may be, and that his job be only the management of C.B.C. funds. This man should know something about all phases of C.B.C. activities. Also, he must report to the Board of Directors of the Corporation and to the licensing board as outlined in article (f).

Article (f): The licensing of television stations and sound broadcasting stations should be put in the hands of a Federal department devoted only to the licensing and control of television and radio stations. This group must be completely independent on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and is not to rely on the C.B.C. in any way. This board should be made up of members of all Parties, so as to prevent influence from any one Party.

THE CHAIRMAN: For the purpose of the record, this is your personal brief?

MR. SHAPIRO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Also for the purpose of the record, we heard you as an individual at the specific request of Mr. Jack St. John, M.L.A., and you are not representing any society or association?

MR. SHAPIRO: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Also for the purpose of the record, you are a young man, how old?

MR. SHAPIRO: Seventeen.

THE CHAIRMAN: And therefore, because of that, I take it you have not had any extensive experience in radio in actual practice, have you?

MR. SHAPIRO: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for presenting your brief. We appreciate the interest that witnesses have in the work we are doing.

MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you.

SUBMISSION OF THE MANITOBA PROVINCIAL
FEDERATION OF LABOUR.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. D. Swailes.

Mr. J. James.

Mr. R. B. Russell.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that presented on behalf of the Manitoba Provincial Federation of Labour. Mr. Swailes, who have you with you?

MR. SWAILES: Mr. Chairman, I have with me Mr. Jimmy James, the President of the Winnipeg Labour Council, and Mr. R.B. Russell, the General Secretary of the One Big Union.

THE CHAIRMAN: First we will mark your brief which we have received as Exhibit No. 56.

EXHIBIT NO. 56: Brief of the Manitoba Provincial Federation of Labour.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed to present that, Mr. Swailes?

MR. SWAILES: Well, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, this submission, you will note, is dated March 5th, 1956 and at that time we had these separate organizations: the Manitoba Provincial Federation of Labour, the Winnipeg and District Trades and Labour Council, the Winnipeg Labour Council and the Central Council of the One Big Union. Since about a couple of weeks ago these organizations are merged on the national scale, and are very close to the process of merging locally.

THE CHAIRMAN: We got a hint of this in Ottawa.

MR. SWAILES: These groups have a membership of approximately 60,000 workers in Manitoba and, with their families, represent a substantial proportion of the people of this Province.

I would like to point out that some of the material that appears here is just as much for the edification of our own people, to whom we submitted this in order to get their approval, as for the enlightenment of your Commission, because we know you will be familiar with a good deal of this material.

We wish to state that our organizations

as indicated by resolutions passed at national conventions, fully approve of control and supervision of radio and television by the C.B.C.

You had a representation from our national organization, and I suppose they submitted the resolution that was passed at the convention recently. That was supported by an overwhelming majority of the 1600 delegates who were present. In fact, there was only one dissenting voice in the discussion, and that was the one that was quoted here this morning by Mr. St. John.

MR. RUSSELL: From Winnipeg.

MR. SWAILES: This brief represents the overwhelming opinion of our groups, but there are still dissentient people and we don't pretend that it is absolutely unanimous approval.

Control by the C.B.C. means that the people of this country, through the medium of democratically elected Parliament, and an agency appointed by Parliament, control this important means of communication, education and entertainment.

We consider that control by the people, over a service which is essentially a monopoly, to be infinitely preferable to control by persons and institutions whose primary purpose is the advertising of commercial products.

The growth of television: To our minds the people of Canada have every reason to be proud of the rapid and widespread growth of television in this country, under the guidance of the C.B.C. In

little more than three years, 28 English and 5 French televasting stations have been put into operation, making possible the viewing of television programmes, through more than 2 million receiving sets, by 80% of the population of Canada, spread over half a million square miles of territory, some of which is very thinly populated.

No country in the world, other than the United States, has a greater proportion of its people using television sets than this country of ours.

In no other country in the world, including the United States, has the growth of television been as rapid as it has been here in Canada.

Television development is still in its infancy, but it is estimated that by 1957 the people of Canada will be linked up by television, by direct microwave network connection, from coast to coast.

Not only has this growth been phenomenal from the point of view of making programmes available to viewers, but Montreal and Toronto rank second and third to New York and Hollywood as producing centres of television performances, on this Continent, and come fourth and fifth of all cities in the whole world.

We think we are very safe in saying that only through the medium of some such organization as the C.B.C. could this early and widespread development of television have taken place in a country so sparsely populated as Canada.

I would like to add my opinion here, Mr. Chairman, that if this development had been left to

the private stations it would have been a very uneven development, that there would perhaps have been competing stations in the more thickly populated cities, but a very large area of our country would still be without any television service whatever, if it had been left to private stations only to carry on with development.

An additional T.V. outlet for Greater Winnipeg: Due to its geographical position, and to the fact that television broadcasts can be picked up by receivers within a radius of only sixty miles or thereabouts of a broadcasting station, the owners of televisions sets within the range of C.B.C. Winnipeg, have only one source of television programme.

If for any reason the viewer has no interest in a particular portion of a programme, there is no alternative available. He must look at a performance in which he has no interest, or turn off the receiver.

This has led quite naturally to a strong demand for a second T.V. outlet in the Greater Winnipeg area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: that this natural dissatisfaction, the impossibility of satisfying everyone, this has been fanned and inflamed by the daily newspapers -- and I feel sure myself, assisted by the private stations -- into something resembling a hymn of hate of the C.B.C. The newspapers have not passed up any opportunity to discredit the C.B.C. Only just recently they

carried big headlines "BREAK THE CBC MONOPOLY".

There was a fantastic proposal to erect an antenna near the border and then to bring these television programmes from the United States stations to Winnipeg by cable and bring them into the houses. It would cost about \$100 per household to install and about \$50 a year for service -- absolutely a fantastic proposal from a business point of view. Yet, this was given headlines in the press -- "BREAK THE CBC MONOPOLY", and that is the kind of thing that has gone on year after year in these attacks on the C.B.C.

I might add too, that I am a fairly close reader of the press but I haven't seen at any time any explanation of the difficulties encountered by the C.B.C. in attempting to build up this particular service.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you were going on to mention some of these difficulties, in your brief.

MR. SWAILES: Yes. To come back again to the matter of a second television station in Winnipeg: We support that demand, and would be pleased to see a second T.V. channel in this area just as soon as it may become possible, in order to give viewers a choice of programmes.

In supporting this proposal for an additional television channel, however, we are fully conscious of the difficulties involved, and we give our approval to the policy determined by the Parliament of Canada with respect to T.V. development in this country. Realizing that our country, with its vast

area and small population would be a difficult one to cover with television service, Parliament decided, that, in the early stages of development at least, only one television outlet would be permitted in each area of operation. Exceedingly rapid progress has been made, but there are still many areas of population in Manitoba, Dauphin, Swan River and Flin Flon, for example, where there is no television service whatever.

I would ask this question, Mr. Chairman: Why have these businessmen who are so anxious for a private station in Winnipeg not tried to develop stations in these areas? It is a fact too that in Brandon, where there is a private television station, there is little or no demand for competition on the part of the C.B.C.

There is the further fact, about which little is generally known, that each new television station in operation places a burden of approximately \$100,000 a year on the C.B.C. for broadcasting material. Every one of the 25 private T.V. stations receives this material free of charge, and naturally, every additional station has the right to expect the same service.

We appreciate the fact, too, that there is a limiting factor in the total amount of good television broadcasting material available. It may be this shortage of good material which has been responsible for the fact that certain broadcasts have been repeated. It is probable that even if a

second outlet in Greter Winnipeg is provided there would be some duplication of programme.

The realization of these difficulties tempers our demand for an additional outlet in Greater Winnipeg, but we do wish to impress upon your Commission the "television isolation" of Winnipeg, so that when it is decided by Parliament that the stage of development has been reached in which additional outlets may be provided, Greater Winnipeg will be given priority of those areas in reach of the T.V. broadcasting stations in the United States -- Toronto, Windsor and Vancouver, for example.

We would rather see a second channel operated as an outlet of the C.B.C., but if it should be privately-owned and operated, we recommend that the C.B.C. continue to control advertising content, and assist in the promotion of quality of production.

Quality of service: We realize to some extent the difficulties and problems faced by the C.B.C. in developing television in Canada. Ours is a country of many nationalities, with people of widely varying opinions and standards of culture. But we have good reason to believe that the vast majority of our people want to enjoy Canadian programmes, produced by Canadian talent, rather than be the mere recipients of programmes from other countries.

The C.B.C. is faced with the problem of producing programmes which will be of interest to all kinds of people, of all ranges of intelligence and cultural growth and of conflicting interests, without

giving too much to one group, and too little to the others.

We know, however, that the C.B.C. is giving primary thought to the development of every kind of Canadian cultural talent, rather than taking the easy road of using imported commercial programmes. We give full approval to this policy of the C.B.C.

Here in Winnipeg evidence was given to the Massey Commission by the Winnipeg Musicians' Association, showing how much support and encouragement had been given by the C.B.C. to the development of musical culture in this city. This evidence showed, too, that the contribution by the privately-owned radio stations with the exception of CKSB St. Boniface, to the development of musical talent, was practically nil. The contrast between the C.B.C. and privately-owned stations was startling.

We refer to CKSB, St. Boniface, not so much as an employer of musicians, but because this station has consistently broadcast a good deal of good music in contrast to the other private stations. Since that submission was made to the Massey Commission showing how little support had been given by the private stations to the employment of musicians, the situation has remained practically unchanged.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are anticipating one of my questions.

MR. SWAILES: I am informed by the Musicians' Association that the four private stations combined in Greater Winnipeg contribute only \$3.60

in musicians' wages to every 100 by the C.B.C., and in round figures it amounts to something like this, that where the C.B.C. is employing approximately 30 musicians at the rate of \$100 a week -- and this is just to give an example -- the four local stations are each employing one musician at \$25 a week; that is the difference. The C.B.C. employ 30 musicians at \$100 a week, and the four private stations employ one musician each at \$25 a week. That does not mean to say they are actually doing that, but that is how it would work out.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are speaking in those figures of radio only?

MR. SWAILES: No, radio and television now, because it refers to the last financial year.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wondered if there was anything unfair in your comparison, because of the fact you are not really comparing like things when you put the television in on the C.B.C. account.

MR. SWAILES: The actual amount spent by the C.B.C. is greater on account of television than it was before television was here.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would think it would be, yes.

MR. SWAILES: Yes. Only the C.B.C. has taken the trouble and gone to the expense of giving encouragement to, and developing, live Canadian talent. In fact, it is very doubtful if the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra could have been kept alive had it not been for the active sympathy and

financial support of the C.B.C.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, at this point that the support and encouragement of the C.B.C. goes much beyond the evidence that was given here by Mr. Keith on Monday. Even before the present Symphony Orchestra was established, a series of summer symphony concerts was promoted which would have been absolutely impossible if the C.B.C. had not broadcast these concerts by remote control. I have been more or less closely connected with the development of symphony work in Winnipeg for thirty years and I know the struggles and disappointments, and I can give some idea as to how deeply we appreciate the assistance of the C.B.C.

This policy of giving thought to the promotion of native talent, rather than taking the easy road of being merely an outlet for American commercial programmes, has brought wide acclaim to the C.B.C. for the quality of its productions.

At the 18th American Exhibition of Educational Radio and Television Programmes held at Ohio State University, the C.B.C. won, or shared more awards for quality of production than any other network.

I don't need to read those, but to bring this up-to-date, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation won six first awards and five honorable mentions for radio and television programmes in competing with American networks at the 20th American Exhibition of Programmes held annually at Ohio

State University, and once again the C.B.C. programmes received more awards than those of any other network. I am quoting from the C.B.C. Times of April 27th.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question I wanted to ask was, that this is the 1956 award?

MR. SWAILES: Yes, this is more recent.

THE CHAIRMAN: I only want to get it clear on the record, because I think it is clear to us.

MR. SWAILES: Yes, this is the April, 1956 edition of the C.B.C. Times.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think there have been reports of the same thing in the daily newspapers also.

MR. SWAILES: Yes. Labour groups are definitely interested in creating and developing radio and television programmes of the highest quality, and in the greatest possible use of Canadian living talent. We contend that the commercializing of radio and television, the selling of programmes for their advertising value tend inevitably to lower the cultural quality of these programmes.

This is borne out by information from Britain where commercial television was introduced last September. That portion of the time on the air when the greatest number of people are watching television, which in pre-commercial times included several programmes of high quality, now includes only quiz shows, give-away programmes and variety performances. I got this from an observer foreign news service, I think it was last December and I will quote from it:

"However, since TV times on the commercial stations sells at £975 a minute, the

advertisers insist on reaching a big audience. Market research groups have shown that quiz, give-away programmes and variety shows attract a greater number of people than those with cultural backgrounds such as symphonic music and serious plays."

Another was an article in the Winnipeg Tribune last night in which the headline is "Commercial TV edges out the B.B.C." I think that must be giving a great deal of concern to people in Britain.

We commend the CBC for its efforts to encourage native Canadian talent, and on such fine productions as Dancers of the Nations, Citizens Forum, and Round Table Conferences. In 1954 - 55, the CBC distributed some eight million dollars to radio and television artists, musicians, singers, actors and script writers.

Were it not for the regulations imposed and administered by the CBC it is extremely doubtful if "freedom of expression" as far as radio and television is concerned would survive in Canada. Probably the holder of unorthodox or "non-conforming" views has less opportunity for time on the air and on television programmes in the United States than he has in Canada. We need to encourage intellectual rebels rather than conformists and to give an opportunity for expression of ideas which may shock listeners at times but will at least encourage broader, deeper and more intensive thought.

We have a very strong suspicion that the newspapers which are in many cases the owners of

private broadcasting stations who have practically a monopoly over the dispensing of news and "opinion influencing" facilities and who have spear-headed that the drive of opposition to the CBC have often "slanted" the words, have given misleading information to the public and in so doing abused their great powers.

There is one example of this here, this is the Winnipeg free press of Wednesday May 2nd and it is a cartoon showing the CBC as an ogre selling A \$32.50 television licence fee and the first line of the editorial says, "The CBC's liking for an annual licence fee on radio and TV sets is readily understandable". Now, scores of people I have spoken to and have spoken to me have been under the impression that Mr. Dunton recommended a television licence fee of \$32.50 a year and I think even the Manitoba Farmers' Union was influenced by this in the statement it made the other day. That is just one example of slanting the news.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was perfectly clear, so that the record is straight, that Mr. Dunton made no such recommendation. He said the method of a licence fee was better than the present method and he pointed out various types of service but it was perfectly true, you are right in pointing out he did not ever recommend a \$32.50 licence fee.

MR. SWAILES: And on page 59 of his submission he goes on to say:

"Presumably it can be held that when radio coverage is as wide as it is at present, nearly all Canadians are able

to derive advantage from it, therefore, it is not unjust that contributions to broadcasting are taken from their general tax payments."

You can just as well say Mr. Dunton recommended that and it was only a statement made by him. Here is another one, again from the Free Press which was published at the time this Commission was first appointed, it is the first of two articles and it begins, "Should Parliament subsidise entertainment", creating a prejudice against them. In the second article they outline the terms of reference of the Commission, creating a feeling before giving the terms of reference. That is the kind of thing I want to bring to the attention of the Committee. Again, here is another one slanting things, it is a cartoon giving a completely wrong conception of what took place at the Labour Congress Convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you are getting a little outside our terms of reference.

MR. SWAILES: I think so. Here is another one, this is from Liberty and it says:

"I spent a two and a half hours recently interviewing A. Davidson (Davie) Dunton the Czar who bosses Canada's state-controlled TV entertainment ---"

That is the kind of thing that is being built up by the newspapers in order to create this feeling against the CBC.

We would urge the CBC to continue to be free from bias and to give every opportunity for expression

of thought, be it popular or unpopular.

The "Forward" to CBC regulations expresses our ideas in this respect to some extent as follows:

"The following regulations provide for only some minimum standards in broadcasting. In holding a broadcasting licence, every station assumes wider responsibilities than those specifically required by these regulations. They include: fair opportunity for the full presentation of different main views and ideas; meeting of different public tastes and wants; serving varied interests in the country; and carrying an adequate amount of broadcasting of different kinds, originating in the community and elsewhere in Canada."

To those who consider that radio and television stations should give the public what they want, we recommend studying of the statement of Mr. Pat Weaver, Chairman of the National Broadcasting Company of the United States, made to the Convention of Television Affiliates:

"Our basic policy is that we won't run a TV network that does not service the public. By that I mean all the public, not merely the heavy habit viewers - if you cater to only the easy viewers, you are really aiming TV downhill to the real trivia type, escape series of nothing.

"In other words, the forces you set in motion if you place too high a value on the heavy viewers are forces that really call for degradation of the service. We don't want to give the people what they want solely. We want to give the people something that will make more of them want more of the better things.

We believe that every show should serve a purpose beyond diversion and every time we can increase information, contact, facts, knowledge, and we deliver a fact somewhere to a mind somewhere in the country, we have added one more tool, one more weapon in the fight against bigotry, stupidity, intolerance and prejudice, and we have taken one more step forward towards sanity, maturity and adulthood.

We are going to programme up and not down. TV is far too great an instrument to be degraded into a home juke-box just to keep the kids quiet".

And now for the CBC regulations and I understand that these regulations were drafted for radio stations and they have not been brought up to date yet for television.

We approve of these regulations which apply to the time and duration of spot announcements, and the necessity for giving the name of the sponsor or

sponsors, the name of a speaker on any talks programme and the name of a candidate speaking on a political broadcast and his political affiliation. Anonymous broadcasting should not be permitted under any circumstances.

We approve of the regulations which limit the proportion of time of a broadcast which may be devoted to advertising. If any change is to be made in this direction, we recommend that it be in the direction of reducing rather than increasing the proportion of time allowed for advertising.

We approve and endorse the regulations which give the CBC power to regulate the character of broadcasting by private stations.

We approve the regulations which prescribe that time be made available to political parties on an equitable basis. If this were not done, those parties with the most cash available would be able to monopolize the available broadcasting time. We would recommend that a further restriction be placed on a number of spot announcements which a political candidate can make. The candidate with the greatest amount of cash available can gain a great advantage over an opponent whose funds are not so plentiful by having spot announcements made frequently throughout the time the station is on the air.

We approve the regulations which tend to promote and ensure the greater use of Canadian talent by corporation and private stations. We would recommend that more pressure be put on private stations to employ

live talent.

We approve the regulations which prescribe the definition of a broadcast programme, as to its being a live programme, a recorded programme, a delayed programme or a transcribed programme. We contend that the listener or the viewer has the right to know the nature and origin of the programme. It is fair and reasonable too that the scripts, announcements, etc., be kept on file by the radio station for a period of at least one year and be available for perusal by a representative of the CBC.

The "pirating" of programmes is properly prohibited by the regulations as no station should have the right to pick up and reproduce the broadcasts of other stations without the consent in writing of a representative of the CBC. The CBC should have the right to control the number of broadcasting stations owned and operated by an individual or a private corporation.

I would like to add here, and I think with the approval of my colleagues that we consider that private networks should be prohibited and we would like to support the submission made by our parent organization to the effect that newspapers should be divorced from financial interest in radio and television stations.

We approve the general policy of the CBC in refraining from entering into competition with the private stations for local advertising, and refraining from competing with the private stations

for local listening and viewing audiences, thus leaving local news, quiz shows, give-away shows and popular recordings to the private stations.

We support the publication of CBC times in various regions, and would recommend that there be no increase in the subscription fee of \$1.00 per annum. It is our opinion that through the medium of Times, the CBC would take the public into its confidence and give a better idea of the difficulties encountered in television service in Canada and of the successes that have been won. Information should be given as to the services provided for those who live in out of the way places, such as the establishment of robot stations in various parts of the country. It would be of great help to the CBC if information of this nature could be sent periodically to labour, business, professional and community organizations. It is rather surprising that the CBC which is really a publicity organization, in my opinion at least, seems to have fallen down in informing the public as to its own efforts.

We consider that it would be very enlightening to the general public if more information is released, as to the extent to which the CBC is providing service for the private stations, particularly in the field of television.

The production of Canadian shows and the developing of Canadian talent and culture undoubtedly is responsible for a good deal of the expense of the CBC in both radio and television divisions. At the present time, according to the report for the year ending March 31, 1955, more than half of the expense

was for programmes while practically 5/6ths of the costs were included in programmes, engineering and network services.

The CBC estimates that it costs about \$15. a year for each television set to provide it with television programmes. That is about the cost of a daily newspaper. Last year the total cost was just under thirty million dollars. With two million sets in operation the cost averaged close to \$15. per set. Last year some of that money was raised by an excise tax on radio sets and parts. Some people argue that the sale of television sets will fall off, but the Vice-President of R.C.A. Victor Company was quoted in the Financial Post, December 17th, 1955, as stating that the demand would never fall off - people would be installing more than one set in their home. We are just including that as his opinion, we are not saying that is our opinion.

About six and a quarter million dollars revenue was obtained by the CBC from the carrying of commercial programmes which paid for the advertising contained in the programmes. Without doubt if the CBC were to carry only commercial programmes, it could operate on a much smaller budget. But it is the avowed purpose of the CBC to develop Canadian talent and that is one of the reasons for the higher cost. We would recommend that the CBC carry on, intensify and enlarge its programmes which are Canadian in culture and which may employ Canadian talent and Canadian labour. We would like to suggest here that

private stations should be obliged to live up to the regulations in connection with live talent and the production of live performances.

We are opposed to any plan of financing which would impose a flat licence fee on each set in use, as this would place the load on that portion of the population least able to bear it. Instead we would recommend that as funds are needed by the CBC they should be made available from the general treasury of the Federal Government. This does not mean issuing a blank cheque to the CBC and letting the corporation spend the money as it pleases. For, over the years, with the annual publication of its accounts, and with the department of government responsible for the CBC being subject to public questioning and criticism every year, it will be possible to gain a fairly clear idea of the general annual cost and to check undue and unwarranted expenditures.

It would be pointed out that if television and radio in Canada were wholly under the control of private agencies, there would be no possibility whatever of such private investigation, questioning and public criticism as may be applied to the CBC. The private corporation could do as it pleased and could tell any enquiring citizen to mind his own business. If the CBC should be, as we recommend, financed more and more from the general treasury, the people in general would pay for that service in accordance with their ability to pay. This is by far the fairest way of financing the operations of a corporation carrying on such a public service.

Further to that, I think the CBC could do something very much like what is done here in Manitoba by the Power Commission, the Telephone Commission and the Hydro Board, they give an estimate of their probable expenses for five or six years ahead so that the government and the legislature has an idea of what is in view. There is very seldom any criticism with respect to allowing the funds for that kind of development and if the CBC could go to Parliament and give some idea of the cost of its expansion and the cost of this work in the next five or six years, provision could be made from the general treasury of the country.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to interject there that this whole question of the nature of the CBC accounts and the way they are made up and the forward projection of their costs on various estimates is already under study by the Commission's financial advisors. We are doing this on our own.

MR. SWAILES: Again, this is just my own thinking that this radio and television service is of such great importance to the people of Canada that the spending of something like \$50,000,000. for this actually fades into insignificance when we figure the \$140,000,000. on liquor alone.

We make these suggestions with a considerable amount of diffidence as there are many factors involved in production, including production techniques and the case of listening and viewing audiences.

Generally speaking we consider that those productions with ear appeal such as orchestral concerts,

would be presented to best advantage on the radio rather than on television. There is little eye appeal in an instrumental performance.

We realize that there are many difficulties in the production of operatic performances, particularly where there are long solos and duets in the score. We consider that long close-ups of soloists are undesirable as they distract attention from the music and attract attention to the facial movements which are not always very artistic. It may be more satisfactory even in solo passages to include the whole or a portion of the stage in the picture so that the movements of the actor in relation to the setting may be observed. With grand opera in particular it may be an improvement to have someone relating the plot of the play so that the viewers may get a better understanding of the real meaning of the music and its relation to the story of the opera. It is our opinion that viewing and listening audiences show a great deal of interest in discussions of social problems such as Citizens Forum, Round Table and Press Conference.

We would suggest that where a number of persons are taking part in a discussion that more time be allowed. For instance, if three persons in addition to a chairman are participating in a discussion on a half-hour programme, it allows one only about eight minutes in which to express his ideas. If there is audience participation in a question period, the time is still further curtailed. We would recommend that audience participation be further encouraged. The

asking of questions tends to bring out points of view which would not otherwise appear. Audience participation is of great interest to viewers as it tends to make the production more spontaneous.

In addition to allowing more time for such discussion programmes, every effort should be made to narrow the subject of discussion so that it would not wander over too wide a field and must become more or less superficial. While each such discussion might be pinpointed with respect to a certain subject the general field of discussion should be constantly broadened. Every point of view should be respected and even unpopular opinions should be given an opportunity of expression. Prepared addresses by individuals on specialized subjects might perhaps be broadcast through the medium of radio rather than television, as the interest is lost and the import of the talk lost when a listener is distracted by the appearance of the speaker reading from a lengthy script.

THE CHAIRMAN: That, of course, depends on the appearance of the speaker.

MR. SWAILES: Similarly choral productions and vocal productions even with orchestral accompaniments might be heard to better advantage on the radio than on television.

While we are proud of the fact that Toronto and Montreal have such wide acclaim as producing centres for television, we would point out that there is a fair amount of talent of all kinds available in Manitoba and we would like to see more productions emanating from the Winnipeg studios. We realize the Winnipeg studio

is the producing centre for the whole of the region and at the present time these facilities are just about crowded to a limit.

As to an independent board, a demand has been made repeatedly by the press and the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters for a separate, so-called independent board to regulate both the CBC and the private stations. The argument is used that it is unfair for the Board of Governors of the CBC to be both a regulator and a competitor. This argument presents a distorted picture of the situation and is based on the faulty premise that the CBC is in competition with the private stations. Far from being in competition with the private stations, the CBC is co-operating with them and helping them in every way to do a good job of broadcasting.

Mr. A. D. Duncan, Chairman of the Board of Governors made this clear in his address to the Canadian Club of Montreal in January of 1956 when he said:

"This rapid development of Canadian TV has come about through co-operation in one over all system between public and private enterprise. The Canadian system is unique in the world in this partnership between public and private organizations to carry network service throughout the country. I think that in no other activity within our own country is there such close and effective linked operation on public and private enterprises."

Every one with knowledge of broadcasting will agree that regulation is necessary. Necessary in the national interest, in the interest of the public to protect them from deceit and exploitation and in the interests of the broadcasting industry in general. This regulatory power was given to the Board of Governors of the CBC some twenty years ago. In that twenty years there have been ten Parliamentary enquiries by committees including all parties into every aspect of the operations of the CBC and in not a single instance has any responsible person been able to sustain a charge that the CBC has not been a truly independent board in the truest sense of the term or that it has been unfair or unjust in its actions and decisions.

Why then appoint another independent board? Why set up another board to supervise the work of a board which has proven beyond any shadow of doubt its independence and its quality? I have here a copy of the British Television Act of 1954 and in Britain the Board supervises the private stations, not the BBC productions and this board is given power to acquire television stations and to do televising of its own in addition to supervising the work of the private advertisers and broadcasters. So, it would be in a similar position if it carried out those instructions as the CBC in Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is that reference? It is a point we have not had before and I would like to know where I can look it up?

MR. SWAILES: It is the Television Act of 1954 of Great Britain.

It is our opinion the only reason for seeking the appointment of another board is to weaken the CBC and give the private stations more latitude for profit making from advertising. We would like to quote from Professor A.R.M. Lower's article in Queen's Quarterly, Volume LX, No. 2:

"I cannot see any turn towards true freedom coming out of private radio or television. On the other hand, ninety out of a hundred people who have had any experience of the matter will agree that under the CBC the essentials of a true freedom have been preserved."

We see no reason for the appointment of another board.

In our opinion the greatest calamity that could befall radio and television broadcasting services in Canada would be to remove the supervision and control now exercised by the CBC and place this service under the control of private corporations. Under control by private corporations, possibility of cultural growth might decrease, as would the development of our native Canadian live talent. Canadian broadcasting and television would become merely an extension of the field of the American Broadcasting Corporations and the same anarchy prevalent there would exist here.

I would like to point out that since 1936 the private stations have had every opportunity to show what they could do in the matter of developing

Canadian live talent and they have done very little indeed.

These corporations have only one purpose, the selling of the greatest amount of advertising. If there is one thing kills the interest in radio or television shows, it is the highly exaggerated chatter of the sellers of soaps, soups, lipsticks, automobiles, etc. With these corporations in control of our radio and television, the advertising content which is already far too great would be increased. Any programmes which did not appeal to the widest selling audience, this would include practically all the programmes which have any claim whatever to cultural quality, would also disappear. The fair use of time for discussion on matters of public interest, the giving of equal time on the air to political parties, the allotting of time for the expression of non-conformist ideas which have little popular appeal would also disappear. Most disastrous of all would be the fact that we would have no voice in suggesting changes or improvements, and the voice from the radio and scenes and voices on television screens would be at work day after day, moulding our thinking and our likes and dislikes on the pattern desired by the American corporations. They could do just as they pleased in the field of radio and television and we would be completely impotent.

The CBC is not perfect by any means, but it is the organization of the people of Canada and as long as it exists, the man and woman who is dissatisfied with the service has some voice in its improvement and



improvements can be made in accordance with the wishes of the people.

We conclude, therefore, with the same statement with which we started this submission, that we approve fully of control by the CBC and would rather see that control extended than curtailed. It belongs to us and we can pay for it in the same way that we pay for other public services, through our income tax payments. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did Mr. Russell or Mr. James wish to add anything?

MR. SWAILES: No, I think it is completed, unless there are some questions.

MR. RUSSELL: There is only one matter I wanted to refer to - in fact, there were a few matters but they were covered by Counsel in the questioning of Mr. St. John when he spoke. I had made notes on them, but I think they have been fully covered.

There is only one thing I would like to draw to your attention and that is that I understand it was St. Patrick who drove the snakes out of Ireland, and St. George who killed the dragon, and now we have a St. John coming forward and attempting to slay this mythical monster, the CBC, which is the creation of his own Liberal government.

Another thing was that Mr. St. John acts on the basis of a resolution passed by the Legislation here in Manitoba, and I think the Commission should note that the Government is not here presenting any brief. The resolution, I think, as was brought out by the

Chairman, was merely another outlet for Winnipeg.

We are in accord with the necessity of another outlet when and at what time it is available, but I want to point out this, that, as the Chairman remarked earlier, this organization we are here representing represents 66,000 members and their families. Mr. St. John is only one member of the Legislature of Greater Winnipeg out of twelve, and his total votes were somewhere round 3,000 in the last election. Out of the 3,000 votes he had 220 telephone calls, so that even those who elected him did not support him in this thing - only that minority; and I think that should be taken care of. Remember that we have a population here in Greater Winnipeg of 330,000 people, and I think the Chairman also pointed out that the views of the combined Labour movement here of Manitoba ought to be given some consideration, and I think it has been adequately dealt with in the brief presented by Mr. Swailes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You understand I pointed out that only to get Mr. St. John's comments, and there is no suggestion at this stage of our views.

---A short recess.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Swailes, on the first page of your brief in the first section where you say that you approve of control by the CBC, in the third paragraph you say, "We consider that control by the people, over a service which is essentially a monopoly, to be infinitely preferable to control by persons and institutions whose primary purpose is the advertising of commercial products." Do you think it is quite accurate

to say that the primary purpose of the private broadcasting stations is the advertising of commercial products? I would have rather said that the primary purpose was the provision of a broadcasting service to the people, such service being supported revenue-wise by commercial advertising: do you think that is perhaps a more accurate way of describing the purpose?

MR. SWAILES: No, I'm afraid I disagree with you, as far as our experience here is concerned. I think the primary purpose of these private organizations is the making of profit from their operations.

MR. COYNE: Well, perhaps that is a little different from ---

MR. SWAILES: And in order to make a profit from their operations they have to advertise goods.

MR. COYNE: Oh, no-one would dispute that, but would you agree that these stations are not owned and operated, for example, by advertising agencies?

MR. SWAILES: No, no.

MR. COYNE: Or by persons in the manufacture of particular products or things of that kind?

MR. SWAILES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it, Mr. Swailes, you are not opposed to the notion of profit per se, are you?

MR. SWAILES: Too much, yes.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 2, Mr. Swailes, where you are dealing with the demand for an additional TV outlet in Winnipeg, and I think you say that, while you support that demand, you don't necessarily support the demand for a station being set up immediately; in

other words, it isn't quite the same demand that we have been hearing about in the last few days?

MR. SWAILES: Yes. We realize that in the early stages of TV development in Canada in particular we must have one station here and there until the greatest part of the country is covered. When that is done, then second stations may be possible, but again I would like to see this; for instance, Dauphin, Flin-flon and Swan River and so on, I think we are being a little bit greedy in Winnipeg to seek a second outlet here when they haven't got one in those other places. So, this is a rather distant prospect in our opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you do put it that you would like to see a second channel, and the reason you give is, "in order to give viewers a choice of programmes"?

MR. SWAILES: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't suppose you are suggesting there that there is any particular merit in mere choice - or is that the point?

MR. SWAILES: Well, this has been the cause of a good deal of dissatisfaction, that when the people didn't like a certain programme in Winnipeg they had nowhere else to turn to and they either watched something they were not interested in or turned it off.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, take newspapers; don't you sometimes get an edition of the newspaper you don't like to read, and you have nothing else to do but not read the paper?

MR. SWAILES: That is right. As a matter of fact, I had this experience with the radio stations: I may dislike something that is on the CBC, and I turn

to each one of the other four stations and find the same kind of thing, so I turn them all off. It could be something like this; it may be that if the CBC had control of two outlets, that it could put a popular programme on one station and a cultural one on the other, and then the popular one on this station and the cultural one on the other one --- this is just a rough definition --- so that those who disliked a certain programme could turn to another one.

THE CHAIRMAN: The purpose of my question is to really test this reason you give for a second TV outlet, mainly, this matter of choice. Because if choice is, in itself, a desirable result, and if this is to be done mainly as a public development, as it has been up to now in Canada, then what is there that should mean that the citizen of Winnipeg or any other large centre should have this desirable right of choice when as a practical matter we know that many other areas of Canada will never be able to have this right of choice? If the choice is a good thing. It should be good for all Canadians, and there is nothing special about living in Winnipeg, Vancouver or Toronto that gives them any extra right.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Mr. Swailes, we have been told on one hand that it would be possible to put in this second channel in Winnipeg without cost to the Government. On the other hand, CBC have asserted to us that every additional channel costs them a certain amount of money. What would be your view if it could

be proven -- because neither side has proven anything - if it could be proven that a second channel could go in without cost to the Government?

MR. SWAILES: That it would be desirable?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, would you support it then, because you don't support it now, as I judge your statement, until such time as overall coverage has been given.

MR. SWAILES: If it could be done in that way, I would say yes, but I have very grave doubts, because I don't think that any private corporation could put on a television performance, particularly using any volume of its own productions and be a commercial success.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, of course, that is a point that has been made with us, but it has not been proven yet.

MR. SWAILES: It could only be done by putting on a lot of film material and entertainment which I would consider to be of a low calibre; but assuming that it could be of the same quality, and could be done without cost, I don't think we would have any objection to it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Quality and cost would loom up in your view?

MR. SWAILES: Yes. Again, to come back to your question, Mr. Chairman, I do see the point and I don't think we have any right to seek a second station as long as these places are without any at all.

MR. COYNE: On the other hand, Mr. Swailes, if the second station was feasible in Winnipeg as a

private operation, which would not be true of, say, Dauphin or some of the smaller places yet to be served, if it was feasible as a private operation, and even assuming it was unable to bring itself up to the level of programming of CBC, whose programmes are subsidized with public funds, would you not think it was still a desirable thing to have a second programme at no cost to the public or to the Government even though the calibre of its programmes was relatively lower than over the national system?

MR. SWAILES: No, I think that it would not be desirable if the quality of the programmes was lower. This was expressed very well by Dr. Lockhart of United College when he said it would result in his children watching television more than ever because they would simply turn channel 1 off and go on to another. I think the quality of programme has a good deal - is a great factor in deciding whether or not a second station should be introduced, but my colleagues are reminding me that we still recommend in our brief that a second station should be under the control of the CBC.

MR. COYNE: Just one further question to finish this subject; I take it from what you tell me that you would feel that the public would be better off without any second station rather than to have a second station whose programmes were material of a lower standard than the CBC?

MR. SWAILES: Decidedly.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Who is going to be the judge of quality?

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think you expected an answer to that question.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I don't think so, no.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the last paragraph of this section where you express the preference of your organizations for the CBC outlet but allow that it may be privately owned and operated, you recommend that the CBC continue to control advertising content and assist in the protection of quality of production; do you have in mind there the sort of situation in television which we now have in radio, that is, second stations and even third stations operated by private enterprise but under the CBC regulation?

MR. SWAILES: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Just turning to page 3, you refer to the ~~support~~ which the CBC has given to musical developments in Winnipeg, and to evidence before the Massey Commission, which you say showed too that the contribution by the privately-owned radio stations, with the exception of CKSB, St. Boniface, to the development of musical talent was practically nil, and I think you refer to that again on page 5: my question would be this; is it fair or is it proper to expect that private stations operated individually and on a purely commercial basis should be in a position to provide the same sort of support for culture which the CBC, using public funds by subsidy, is able to provide? Is there any real comparison to their position?

MR. SWAILES: No, you have quite a good point there, that the CBC is using public funds and would naturally be expected to employ that living talent,

but the private stations are given what is actually this privilege of using this service on the understanding that they do use and develop some living Canadian talent.

MR. COYNE: "Some"?

MR. SWAILES: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Yes,

MR. SWAILES: And the point that we make is that they have done practically nothing in that direction, and that has been true, ever since private stations came into business.

MR. COYNE: ON the other hand, one representation that some of the private interests have made to us is that they have never really had a chance. For example, they say, "If we were permitted to form networks, syndications..." if you like "...and spread the costs of production over a series of outlets in much the same way as the CBC operates its network, then it would be financially feasible to do more in this line". They say, "If you cut off our right to a network, then you do not permit us to be in a position to devote any sizeable sums to this factor". Now, could you comment on that representation?

MR. SWAILES: We have said in the brief that we are opposed to the idea of private networks. We think it gives them too much power over this matter of news and views and communication and formation of opinion. It is possible that if there were a network of private stations and that a programme produced in Winnipeg were recorded here and the records sent to

the other stations, or where it was broadcast by remote control to the other stations, that the unit cost would be lower; there is no doubt about that. But, again, the effort of the private stations has been so small that we don't see much possibility of that developing.

MR. COYNE: And your position is that you are against all private networks; am I right?

MR. SWAILES: That is it.

MR. COYNE: Even assuming, say, a situation where the national network was continuing to operate and providing national service, and private broadcasters showed that they were able, without destroying or affecting the national network, to operate another network without cost to the taxpayer -- would you carry it that far?

MR. SWAILES: I think we would carry it to that degree.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to explore that a little further, because maybe this use of the word "network" is causing a little confusion. Your main complaint is that the private stations have perhaps never been able to do as much as CBC, but they haven't done anything, or virtually nothing, in the way of encouraging Canadian production and employment of Canadian musicians and that sort of thing?

MR. SWAILES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Supposing it could be shown, whether you call it a network or a co-operative arrangement between several stations, to spread the unit cost,

to use your phrase, or some other way, that you could have the private stations employing more musicians, doing some developing of other Canadian talent, wouldn't this be worthwhile? Wouldn't it be worthwhile to your members?

MR. SWAILES: Mr. Chairman, if they were to do that, shall we say altruistically, yes; but we are very much afraid that in their desire to reach the widest listening audience, which is necessary for them to get their advertising revenue, that the quality of the programmes would deteriorate?

THE CHAIRMAN: What difference does it make to you?

MR. SWAILES: Well, that is just one part of the answer. The other one is, I think, we would support to some extent the position taken by the United College that, basically, we would rather see the whole thing under public control and operation than in the hands of private corporations who are using these services mainly for the purposes of getting something out of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point is that private stations have not employed enough musicians - let us take just that one. Their answer is: "Well, we can't do it with the cost borne by only one station, but we could do it if we had five stations in on this." Whether they sell the programme or make a dollar on it or don't, to the development of Canadian talent, it does make a bit of difference?

MR. SWAILES: No, if as a result of those activities they did employ more Canadian artists, to

that extent it would be to the good, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, what I am trying to do is say that some of these rigidly held points of view ought to be continually re-examined because there may be different and better ways of doing it?

MR. SWAILES: Yes. My colleague reminds me again that we are still insisting it should be under the control of the CBC regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN: That, I understand.

MR. COYNE: Turning now to page four where you are dealing with news, views and communications, and you make the point that in your view the existence of the CBC has been most valuable in maintaining freedom of expression.

MR. SWAILES: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Paradoxically, we have on more than one occasion had precisely the opposite view expressed, and it has been based on this principle, if you like, which, it is suggested, has some validity in the field of printing press, that "is it safe to permit control over the expression of opinion to rest with what is a government agency?": in other words, is not there some danger from government control of media of communications? Would you care to express a view on that point?

MR. SWAILES: There is a tendency to separate the Government from people and, after all, Government, when all said and done, is an instrument for carrying out the wishes of people, and people have a voice in

the selection of their government. Now then, when it comes to the manner of assuring a freedom of expression we think the experience since the CBC has been in operation has been that there has been the greatest possible amount of freedom of expression, not wholly, because I think I have had some criticism from time to time myself, but in the private sector, where the private broadcaster is seeking at all times to seek the widest listening audience, those programmes where there are individual opinions which are of not wide interest - for instance, our "Provincial Affairs", I don't think anybody listens to Provincial Affairs. They don't have a wide listening audience and naturally the private stations would avoid such programmes, thus not giving an outlet for the expression of those opinions because they would not appeal to the largest listening audiences. That is how I feel about it.

MR. COYNE: I take it you are, by and large, satisfied that the CBC in the past has so conducted itself that there was a large measure of freedom of expression, but would you agree that in principle there is possibly a danger in concentrating the control of media of communication in the hands, for example, of a government with whose views large elements in the population happen to disagree?

MR. SWAILES: There are safeguards; we get safeguards of this kind in the Unemployment Insurance Commission where you have courts of referees who determine whether or not an individual is being fairly treated by the Unemployment Insurance Commission, and

this could be safeguarded by the establishment of committees which I think was recommended by our parent organization, but working with the CBC to assure it is constantly maintained throughout the areas, and it would not be an organization on its own laying down the law but would be seeking the wishes of the people through the medium of these advisory committees and in that way conforming to the desires of the people. I think that would be the best way of lessening the danger of that kind of autocratic control.

MR. COYNE: What you are really speaking of is really a working arrangement - the danger is that it may still be there?

MR. SWAILES: The danger is there with all government corporations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Am I right in thinking that you would summarize your views on this point by saying this has to be recognized as a potential danger, that it ought to be watched, but that so far you have not found any actual danger?

MR. SWAILES: I think so, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are in the same position as Mr. Sifton on the subject of media being in the same hands.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 5, at the bottom you say, "We approve the general policy of the CBC in refraining from entering into competition with the private stations for local advertising."; that has been their policy in respect of radio?

MR. SWAILES: Yes.

MR. COYNE: I understand, however, that in television in the areas where they have stations they do solicit and accept local advertising?

MR. SWAILES: Oh yes, that is quite true.

MR. COYNE: Are you recommending that if the single channel policy is altered and there are second stations in a similar manner to radio that the CBC should then refrain from entering into competition with the private stations for local advertising?

MR. SWAILES: Oh yes, I think the same policy could be followed with respect to television as has been followed with respect to radio, and then, Mr. Chairman, if you don't mind, that brings me to the point of this resolution that was submitted in the Legislature by Mr. St. John, because with due respect to the members of the Legislature, I don't think they fully understood what was meant by "competition between the CBC and the private stations" because if the CBC were to go into competition with the private stations on television as well as radio they could take a great deal of that revenue away from the private stations.

MR. COYNE: And you are saying that as a matter of principle you think that the same method should be followed in television as in radio?

MR. SWAILES: We have no objection to that.

MR. COYNE: Well, that brings up the matter of revenues, because the CBC presently derives large commercial revenues from commercial advertising.

MR. SWAILES: Well, its revenues are largely from national advertising.

MR. COYNE: Well, it depends what you mean by "largely". They do derive large revenues from national advertising, but the CBC told us that they derive large revenues from local advertising.

MR. SWAILES: That would be in television?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, in television.

MR. COYNE: From Winnipeg, Toronto and Montreal.

MR. SWAILES: That would be only in television.

MR. COYNE: Only in television, yes.

(PAGE - follows)

ake DD

THE CHAIRMAN: And the extention of the present policy as to advertising in radio to get a competitive television system would mean that the C.B.C. would lose revenue from that local television advertising and thereby increase costs from the general fund?

MR. SWAILES: That is a possibility that if second stations were introduced that it would cut into the revenue of the C.B.C. which then perhaps would have to make it up by additional appropriations from the national treasury.

THE CHAIRMAN: We just want to be sure you understand that was implicit in this picture.

MR. SWAILES: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Then, turning to another point of your brief, Mr. Swails, why do you say there should be no increase in the subscription fee of \$1.00 per annum before the C.B.C. Times, do you know whether that covers the cost of producing the magazine?

MR. SWAILES: No, the only thing is we would like to see a greater circulation, more widely read and increasing the cost would have a tendency to cut down this circulation.

MR. COYNE: Then, in the lower part of the page you dismiss the matter of financing the C.B.C. and you make certain suggestions and at the top of the next page you say, "this does not mean issuing a blank cheque to the C.B.C.", and also you have spoken

of the fifteen dollars percent scale that has been mentioned and you also say:

"We would recommend that the C.B.C. carry on, intensify and enlarge its programme which are Canadian in character and which employ Canadian talent and Canadian labour."

The C.B.C. brief, as you probably know, has dealt with the potential cost of increasing Canadian content of their programmes and they say in effect that on the fifteen dollars a set they cannot do it, and I think the figure they mentioned was that they needed an extra five dollars a set. Now, you say, "this does not mean issuing a blank cheque to the C.B.C. --", has your organization any idea of the size of cheque that should be issued to the C.B.C. That is, what level, what amount of funds should properly be provided for this.

MR. SWAILES: No, we have not gone into the actual appropriations that we think should be provided. We think the C.B.C. should advise parliament as to what it considers its expansion is going to cost, and over a period of years, perhaps could try to visualize the cost over the next five years and estimate the additional appropriations that would be needed.

MR. COYNE: And when you say in this first paragraph on page 7, you mention the accounting to parliament, I take it you are not suggesting that the C.B.C. should be financed by means of an annual grant to be determined each year by parliament.

MR. SWAILES: No, that is what we are

thinking in terms of a five year programme or something of that kind which would say forty million dollars next year, fifty million dollars the next year and sixty million dollars and so on.

MR. COYNE: So you suggest that the C.B.C. should have some assurance in advance.

MR. SWAILES: Yes, very decidedly because I do not think the C.B.C. can operate knowing only one year in advance, they have to think in at least terms of five years. I think at the present time they do not even know one year ahead.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just one question before you leave that section of page 6 near the bottom where you say:

"We would recommend that the C.B.C. carry on, intensify and enlarge its programmes which are Canadian in character and which employ Canadian talent and Canadian labour."

Do you draw any distinction between the different types of programmes as to the amount of intensification, in other words, is there a difference in your mind between the informative programmes, panel discussions and the like and matter of what might be called pure entertainment on the other end?

MR. SWAILES: No, I think we all realize that we have one thousand and one different tastes and the C.B.C. is trying to satisfy those tastes but what we would like to see is a development of that Canadian programme whether it be symphony orchestra, round table discussions or anything of that kind.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point I was raising here was, this is under the heading of financing and it may well be there is a difference in the costs involved that limits it and there may be a tendency to pick and choose among the kind of Canadian content programmes.

MR. SWAILLES: Yes, I think the C.B.C. in the past has shown fairly good judgment in once and a while producing an outstanding show which has cost a great deal of money and then in between putting on shows which were less in cost. I think as time goes on and our population increases and we get wealthier perhaps more of these more expensive programmes may be produced.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that I have one other question on that page; I have yet to find anybody who likes a licence fee but I have had various reasons against it and I think this one is new and I think a little surprising. You say there should not be a licence fee as this would place a load on that portion of the population least able to bear it. Do you really think anybody who can afford a television set need worry about paying a licence fee?

MR. SWAILLES: Perhaps that is not expressed as well as it might be because it would mean that the man who had purchased a 17" set and just perhaps able to maintain it and the man who had purchased a very expensive set and who would never miss the money would both pay the same fee.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is cutting it pretty

fine.

MR. SWAILES: Well, we should have expressed that a little better.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Swailes, on page 7 in the second paragraph you say:

"It would be pointed out that if television and radio in Canada were wholly under the control of private agencies, there would be ^{no} possibility whatever of such private investigation, questioning and public criticism--"

Is that necessarily so? I am thinking of such matter as the insurance business, the banking business, we have the government departments?

MR. SWAILES: No, perhaps that is not exactly correct because even if it was all under private control that could not possibly still have a Royal Commission investigating it.

MR. COYNE: Well, we do have many instances I think, where the government is not actually in business but there are regulations which are applied by government agencies to the control of such private business.

MR. SWAILES: Yes, but the ordinary individual and the ordinary organization would not have the same channel of approach and would not be able to exercise the same influence over a privately owned organization that it has on the publicly owned because they feel free to criticize, more free to criticize the publicly owned institution.

MR. COYNE: It is a matter of degree.

MR. SWAILES: It is a matter of degree, yes.

MR. COYNE: Well then, on page 8 in the last paragraph of your section on suggestions you say:

"We realize of course that to the degree that the C.B.C. increases the scope and quality of its own productions, to that extent it is further subsidizing the private stations."

And now, I would just like to ask you about that phrase. Substantially, Mr. Dunton, when he appeared before us, refused to agree that it was a subsidy because he said although certain programmes are provided free to the private stations, the private stations in turn provide the public service of disseminating those programmes to the listeners in their areas and in effect there is a quid pro quo, there is government money spent on the production and the private station is the vehicle for distributing the service. Do you think it is quite accurate to use the phrase "subsidising" in circumstances of that kind?

MR. SWAILES: Well, of course, Mr. Dunton is a greater authority than I am, but I am inclined to believe that it still is a subsidy to the private stations. Take, for instance Brandon. Brandon has a private station and without the material that he gets from the C.B.C. I doubt very much whether he could stay in business.

COMMISSION STEWARD: On the other hand, do you not agree that at Brandon, had there not been

a private station the C.B.C. would probably be in there at some cost to the taxpayers of Canada?

MR. SWAILES: Yes, the C.B.C. may be in there, yes, there is that possibility.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, if the private station co-operation were not pressed there may be a greater public charge through the need to create these facilities out of public money.

MR. SWAILES: Oh yes, I agree with you, on the other hand, there is that possibility I think that has been expressed before, the C.B.C. would also get additional revenues from the local advertising in those areas.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Chairman, I think that concludes the questions I wanted to ask.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have only one final question. Mr. Swailes, this comes under the heading of good clean fun, but I notice that on page 9 you say there is quite a lot of anarchy in the United States broadcasting business, I think you used the words, "the same anarchy prevalent there would exist here"?

MR. SWAILES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do point out in earlier stages of your brief you seem to be quoting with approval the President of the American Broadcasting Corporation. Thank you very much for your presentation.

SUBMISSION OF THE CANADIAN LEGION OF THE
BRITISH EMPIRE SERVICE LEAGUE MANITOBA AND
NORTH WESTERN ONTARIO COMMAND

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I have to apologize, unfortunately Mr. Hocking was required to leave a few minutes ago but I would like to introduce to you Mr. Andrew Moore. Mr. Moore is a member of the Canadian Legion, he has been very interested in the preparation of our brief especially from the educational avenues that television has been opening up and I would ask you to listen to Mr. Moore.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as exhibit 57.

EXHIBIT NUMBER 57: Brief of the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League, Manitoba and North Western Ontario Command.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you present the brief as seems best to you either by reading or summarizing it, just as you prefer.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this is a fairly small brief and perhaps I may be permitted to read it. I may say it is not presented in the spirit of any special pleading, it is just an attempt to put up a point of view from an organization that has no political or economic interest in the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are very interested in these briefs from organizations such as yours.

MR. MOORE: Gentlemen, among other things your terms of reference empower you to examine and make

recommendations upon (b) the measures to provide an adequate proportion of Canadian programmes for both public and private television broadcasting, (f) the licensing and control of private television and sound broadcasting stations in the public interest and (g) such other related matters as the Commissioners consider should be included in reporting properly upon those specified.

This brief is presented by the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League, Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Command. The membership of this organization is found in over 200 branches throughout Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario with a membership of 28,000 ex-servicemen and women. - 28 of these branches are situated in the Greater Winnipeg Area. It is also supported by branches of Ladies Auxiliaries with a membership of 8,000.

The prime object of this organization is service; service to the widows and dependents of those who paid the supreme sacrifice, and assistance to any war veteran or his dependents in need, to commemorate the memory of the fallen, to promote the spirit of comradeship among veterans, regardless of age, creed or colour and to assist in charitable and community work.

The former is carried out to a high degree by our many branches both in the cities and rural districts; the latter also as is evidenced by the sponsorship of Cadet corps of all branches of the

services, teen age clubs, all types of athletics and sports and other community efforts. In the field of education, well over 60 scholarships are awarded annually throughout the province and it is in this field that the value of Radio & Television Broadcasting is recognized, not only as a means of entertainment but also as a field of education for both young and adults. Much thought and study has been given to the value of these two media to all walks of life; this being the main reason for the submission of our brief. (Note. - The Canadian Legion (BESL) has no economic or political interest in radio and/or television broadcasting and it believes that, to an exceptional degree, it represents the views of the ordinary citizen.)

The purpose of this Brief is to bring to the attention of the members of this Royal Commission the desire of the 'embership of the Veterans' .
Organization we represent that television broadcasting should be placed on exactly the same basis as our present day radio broadcasting with the exception that the governing body, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, should retire from the actual broadcasting field, restricting its activities to control. selection, guidance and placement of the various outlets in Canada from where radio and television broadcasts emanate. It is further desired the television broadcasts be bent more in the direction of awakening a truly Canadian National consciousness.

Under a democratic government, the ethics of society and free enterprise our government does not compete with the governed (the common people); the wholesaler does not compete in the retailers' market; the producer does not compete with the distributor and it would therefore appear the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation occupies an anomalous role being both governor and broadcaster on the broadcasting selection, guidance and placement, with all these simply imply, the course would be open for the operation of private television stations and consequent choice of programme selection and development of provincial talent.

Television, more than radio, is a very important factor in formulating a national consciousness. Complaint has reached the Canadian Legion reference the nature of television broadcasts depicting incidents of the Second World War in which exploits of the United States forces dominate the scene, although Canadian forces were involved in the same action. While it is recognized Canadian television was perhaps not developed to the point where a record of Canadian forces in action could be chronicled for posterity, it is felt by some of those who have served, their achievements are somewhat discounted by the showing of the ultra American films of the war, and their impact on Canadian National consciousness might be damaging enough to merit a discontinuance of their showing, replacing them with films effecting the greater development of Canadian culture, artistry

and education.

This brief submits eight recommendations -

1) That, in addition to CBWT, a second television station be authorized immediately to serve the Greater Winnipeg area and vicinity.

2) That, within two years a third television station be considered to serve the Greater Winnipeg area and vicinity.

3) That the operation of both these new television stations be open to private enterprise.

4) That a central control by an independent Board or Commission is necessary and desirable for both radio and television throughout Canada.

5) That the Board or Commission exercising such control take no part in either radio broadcasting or television broadcasting.

6) That, except in national emergencies, there be no direct government control or interference with either radio broadcasting or television broadcasting in Canada.

7) That appeal from adverse decision from Board or Commission be to a Federal Court against miscarriage of justice.

8) That, where these recommendations deal specifically with the Greater Winnipeg area we further recommend that similar principles be applied to other cities and/or areas according to the circumstances in each case.

We are informed that -

1) There are at least 60,000 television sets

and at least 125,000 homes in the Greater Winnipeg area and its television range. In this area live over half a million people who have already spent something like \$20,000,000 on television of which about \$3,000,000 have gone to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation by way of the 15% tax.

2) Technical advice has shown that there is sufficient economic resource and user-demand to justify another television station immediately in the Greater Winnipeg area.

3) At least three Manitoba business concerns have applied for a license to build and operate a television station here and we understand that they are financially competent for this purpose.

4) Local business men find it very difficult to secure suitable time-periods for advertising on CBWT and national commitments leave few desirable periods available for local cultural and other non-commercial broadcasting on CBWT.

5) The Manitoba Legislature and the City Councils of both Winnipeg and St. Boniface have all passed resolutions favoring more television here.

1) Another television station or two in the Greater Winnipeg area should give employment to more local talent and also help to build up a roster of technical personnel which we understand is in short supply.

2) Another television station or two here should stimulate not only sales of receivers but also

maintenance and repair service.

3) At present Winnipeg television is dominated by programmes from elsewhere. If an American station was set up just south of the border this situation would be aggravated and the cost would be increased for local viewers who attempted to avail themselves of its service.

4) We have five local radio stations but only one television station. The latter situation is particularly unsatisfactory because the Winnipeg area is too far away to consistently pick up any other television satisfactorily.

5) Some three years ago, on March 30, 1953, (see Hansard page 3393) the Honourable J. J. McCann, Minister of National Revenue, who answers for the C.B.C. in the House of Commons, said:

"The principle of one station to an area is to apply only until an adequate national television system is developed. At the rate that applications are now being received it may not be long before there is a sufficient degree of national coverage to justify the government and the C.B.C. giving consideration to permitting two and perhaps in some cases more than two stations in certain areas. It is anticipated that in due course, private stations will be permitted in areas covered by C.B.C. stations and the C.B.C. may establish stations in some areas originally covered by private stations."

In view of the fact that applications for

private stations at Winnipeg have been made to the Board of Governors of the C.B.C. - we believe that: the national interest will be better served by the immediate operation of another television station to serve the Greater Winnipeg area, because no such locality should continue to be unduly flooded with views and talent from elsewhere.

6) Since the free flow of accurate information freely interpreted is the life blood of democracy, it is imperative that such important disseminating media as radio and television should be free from all monopolistic control whether by the state or by private interests. They should, however, be subject to reasonable supervision and direction, especially on the operational side, from a semi-judicial independent Board of Commission which will not enter into competition in broadcasting.

This thought is emphasized in the Massey Report, Chapter 28, Section (c) - quote

" That persons engaged in radio broadcasting in Canada directly and adversely effected by a final decision of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation on any matter which this Board has final authority, be granted the right of appeal to a Federal Court against substantial miscarriage of justice".- end of quote, and as reaffirmed on page 303 subsection (d).

All of which is respectfully submitted on behalf of the Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Command of the Canadian Legion, B.E.S.L.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Moore. Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Just referring to page 2 of your brief where you say the television broadcasting should be placed on exactly the same basis as radio with the exception that the governing body should retire from the actual broadcasting field, do you mean by that that they should cease to operate radio stations but continue to produce programmes for distribution through the private stations or do you feel that they should not produce any broadcast material for anybody's use?

MR. MOORE: I think the answer is that this brief envisages an overall controlling body with a government, I should not say government controlled, I thought you were going to throw that one at me, the C.B.C. I assume is not government controlled particularly but I think our brief makes the point, Mr. Chairman, that there should be an overall governing or controlling body and out of the people who are broadcasting in competition with each other, including the C.B.C. type of organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: This particular point was unclear to me as it apparently was to Mr. Coyne, we are not too sure as to what it is you are contending whether the name is still called the C.B.C. or some other name, do you contemplate the provision of programmes for both radio and television by a public body supported by public funds?

MR. MOORE: Yes, and I might add that some years ago I had an opportunity on a scholarship to study the economic and educational set-up in Denmark and I think they have showed the way in quite a bit of this activity of this type. Over there if a private corporation is becoming too strong or charging too much or whatever it may be the government in many cases has set up an organization in competition with them. The basic thought in a part of this submission is that monopolistic control is undesirable that if you keep the government and private interest in active competition, not the cut throat law of the jungle but in active competition you keep them both on their toes.

MR. COYNE: So that what you are suggesting is that the C.B.C. should continue to broadcast or provide programmes, that there should also be private broadcasting and that the C.B.C. should not control the private broadcasting there should be an independent board or commission to control both.

MR. MOORE: My thought, I think is that the C.B.C. will enter into competition with private broadcasting under a referee type of independent board.

MR. COYNE: Who would have jurisdiction over C.B.C. and the private broadcasters as well?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have some other comments here by way of amplification of a point ---

MR. COYNE: Well this might be an appropriate

point, I was going on to another point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this amplification of this point.

MR. MOORE: No.

MR. COYNE: The only other question I wanted to ask, Mr. Moore, arises out of a statement on page 5 and you say:

"Since the free flow of accurate information freely interpreted is the life blood of democracy, it is imperative that such important disseminating media as radio and television should be free from all monopolistic control either by the state or by private interests."

The question I wanted to ask you, Mr. Moore, was in connection with those smaller places where there is, by reason of the limited number of channels or the lack of sizable support, there is only one radio or television station which inevitably becomes a monopoly in that particular area and there are some areas in which this is true of a C.B.C. station and there are some areas where it is true of private stations. Now, have you any suggestions as to how this danger of monopolistic control can be dealt with in this situation? This is not the Greater Winnipeg area obviously but the smaller places.

MR. MOORE: Well, would it not be one of the functions of the overall governing body to settle that question at that time, at that

particular place and base it on the circumstances involved.

MR. COYNE: That is, you would envisage that this overall body would keep an eye on this situation and would operate to control or to remove any abuses which they found to have resulted?

MR. MOORE: In so far as necessary, and they might even change the interest that had that monopoly.

MR. COYNE: And again you would say there is no distinction, there is no difference if it happens that the local station is a C.B.C. station or if this local monopolistic station is a private station?

MR. MOORE: It was on that same point that I had some further amplification. The comments are aimed at supporting this recommendation. They are not intended as criticism of the functioning of the C.B.C. which is probably doing the best it can under the circumstances. We, as a body don't know but we are assuming it. These comments are not to be construed as criticism of any particular government, whether Dominion or Provincial. These governments are all pretty much the same so far as exercising monopolistic controls are concerned and these further comments of mine are not in specific criticism of a private enterprise which when it enjoys a monopoly tends to become undesirable, but private monopolies tend to exploit the consumers and it would appear that the more

extensive the monopoly the more the law of the jungle prevails. However, unlike most government monopolies we have some laws that purport to constrain the private monopolies, and I was making the premise to start with, sir, because what I am going to say now may seem a little critical and, as I said, before we are not here as experts in the field or anything of that kind, but just representing the man on the street in so far as possible - at least the legion.

Since radio and television have such vast potentialities in education, not only at the school level, but also for adult education, we might take a look at the present government monopoly in school level education.

THE CHAIRMAN: It does seem to me although those comments do illustrate the general thought you have on monopoly, that we are getting a little away from the terms of reference.

MR. MOORE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to ask you one question about your first two recommendations on page 3. I think you were here this morning, Mr. Moore,

MR. MOORE: No I wasn't here this morning.

THE CHAIRMAN: We had a considerable discussion with various witnesses throughout the hearings here arising from this suggestion of a second television outlet, and I see the legion

out does anything else we have heard, you want a third one inside of two years, if possible. It has been suggested without anything being completely proven yet, that the addition of another T.V. outlet will add something to the cost of supplying national programmes to that station and it has also been suggested that there are other parts of Canada where there are no television outlets, and where at the moment there isn't even a choice of one station let alone a choice of two. Do those facts in any way modify your suggestion, the first one that a second television station be authorized immediately to serve The Greater Winnipeg Area and vicinity?

MR. MOORE: I think the thought was that this second station and probably the third would be without expense to the public funds.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it has been suggested to us that any type of private station that exists today in a television area, if that were the model it would certainly cost more public funds?

MR. MOORE: Well, it may if the C.B.C. were helping it along the lines that it does now, but if they were in straight competition, not necessarily. I don't think it would concern the legion whom we represent, even if it did cost the government a little more to have a second station immediately mainly to finance---

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but if there is some allocation of public money going into it do you think Winnipeg should get a second television station

before other parts of Canada contributing to the general tax revenue, get any service at all?

MR. MOORE: The answer is yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think you should get it first?

MR. MOORE: Because we feel that if private enterprise is getting an opportunity ---

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I didn't ask you that. I said if there is an allocation of public taxes going into the creation of a second station do you think Winnipeg should get a second one before other part of Canada get a first one?

MR. MOORE: That is my interpretation.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Put it another way; if by reason of Winnipeg obtaining a second station the extension of the national system to cover the whole of Canada would be retarded, what would be your view? We are trying to elicit information to see where we stand.

MR. BLACKWELL: I think the thought we had was that the private enterprise station would not require any government assistance or any taxpayers' money going into it other than the control that would be carried out by the government body.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, there is one point of view not proven yet to the effect that additional stations, whether privately financed or not, represent a certain amount of cost to the

government one way or the other.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is not proven?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: No, but since it has been brought up naturally we are endeavouring to get as many opinions on the subject, particularly where an application has been received for a second station, whether or not that would influence the view of those who are asking for the second station.

MR. BLACKWELL: I don't imagine for one moment that our organization would feel that this locality should have a second station if, as you say, it would retard the possibilities of progress of the system in other parts of Canada, but in our line of thinking from the information we had, this private enterprise station would not take any of the taxpayers' money.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, of course, we are not sure ourselves that it would, but since it have been brought up we are getting your opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The concept behind this is that there is not an unlimited amount of money for this service, and if it is taken from one thing directly or indirectly, or adds to the cost, then there may be nothing left for others.

MR. MOORE: That may be something for a special authority but I do feel from the sessions in our committee that we would not think the extra cost to public funds for such a station here would justify making any such comparison.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, we have no idea what it would cost any way.

MR. MOORE: We haven't either.

MR. BLACKWELL: Our line of thinking was that it was not.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, since this was a brief emphasizing the objections to monopolistic control either way I regretted a little. I was not given the opportunity to develop some reasons for that in the line of monopolistic control, particularly in the area of education. I am not going to start on it, but radio and television have tremendous possibilities in future for education. One of the handicaps that education travels under right now in Canada is the fact that it is largely a government monopoly and I could give you all sorts of facts - not fancies - to prove that. One reason the education in Canada is not as good as the education in England is that over there it is not a government monopoly. There are all sorts of private schools which keep the government monopoly on its toes.

I would regret it very much if radio and television broadcasting became a government monopoly.

THE CHAIRMAN: I didn't mean to stop you saying anything you felt you should say, but I did feel you were getting into a discussion on general education and we have got enough to worry about.

MR. MOORE: No, I was just getting on the

medium of radio and television in education.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. This completes the list of briefs we are to hear at this session in Winnipeg, and I want to publicly thank the many organizations and individuals who took the trouble to prepare briefs and to come here and submit to very searching questions which we tried to give them in order to elicit the fullest public discussion of this problem. We appreciate the interest that has been taken and we appreciate the way it has been done. I think it has been a good-humoured and pleasant debate that we have had, and it has been very helpful to us in our study.

I would also like publicly to thank the ^{of} Government/Manitoba, and Premier Campbell personally for their courtesy in making these facilities available for our hearings in the parliament buildings in Winnipeg.

We will now adjourn until 10 o'clock on Friday in Regina.

---Whereupon the hearings adjourned at 5.05 p.m.

INDEX

<u>SUBMISSION OF:</u>	<u>Page</u>
LE CERCLE MOLIERE DE ST-BONIFACE ...	1206
Mr. Denis Belair	
L'ASSOCIATION DES ANCIENS ELEVES DU COLLEGE DE SAINT-BONIFACE ...	1218
M. Louis Deniset	
M. Maurice Miron	
INDIVIDUAL BRIEF ...	1234
Mr. Jack St. John, M.L.A.	
INDIVIDUAL BRIEF	
Mr. M.F. Shapiro	1294
THE MANITOBA PROVINCIAL FEDERATION OF LABOUR ...	1302
Mr. D. Swailes	
Mr. J. James	
Mr. R.B. Russell	
THE CANADIAN LEGION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE SERVICE LEAGUE, MANITOBA AND NORTH WESTERN ONTARIO COMMAND. ...	1354
Mr. Moore	

